CHRIST AND CULTURE IN PARADOX:

THE ATTITUDES OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CLERGYMEN

IN THE UNITED STATES TOWARD PARTICIPATION IN WAR

———

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of

The School of Theology at Claremont

———

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Ministry

———

by

David Ralph Larson

April 1973

This dissertation, written by

DAVID RALPH LARSON

,

has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty
of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

_____

_____

_____

_____
Date

_____
Dean

PREFACE

For more than one hundred years, Seventh-day Adventist leaders in the United States of America have advocated a position with respect to participation in war which they call "noncombatancy." This stance includes the recommendation that persons refrain from enlisting in any of the armed forces. It also includes the suggestion, however, that if persons are conscripted they consent to participate in those aspects of military life which do not entail personal and direct participation in the destruction of human life. In actual practice, many, if not most, Seventh-day Adventists who have participated in military life have done so in various medical and paramedical capacities.

In recent years, Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy has experienced a significant amount of criticism and censure from within as well as without its own tradition. It has been attacked for being overly militaristic. It has also been criticized for being indifferent toward social, political, and economic concerns. Some have declared that it is ambivalent on the issues surrounding Christian participation in warfare.

The survey administered in the preparation of this dissertation attempted to ascertain whether or not any significant patterns prevail in the attitudes of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist clergymen in the United States of America toward various possible positions on participation in war. It also attempted to determine whether or not the ministers' several attitudes are related to each other, to certain of the

ministers' theological opinions, and to certain of their personal char-

acteristics.

The dissertation's first two chapters review the history of

Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy and describe the procedures utilized

in the administration of the survey. Its third and fourth chapters pro-

vide a report of the survey's findings. The dissertation's fifth and

sixth chapters offer an interpretation and evaluation of Adventism's

traditional tendencies with respect to participation in war. The in-

terpretation applies a typology developed by H. Richard Niebuhr and the

evaluation reflects the writer's personal convictions.

As a Seventh-day Adventist who was registered with the Selective

Service System of the United States as a noncombatant before he received

his ministerial classification, the writer is a participant as well as

an observer of the position under consideration. Whether or not his

biases and prejudices have distorted his perceptivity and objectivity

is for others to decide.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

v

Roy E. Branson, Assistant Professor of Christian Ethics at Andrews University, served the writer as a demanding teacher and loyal friend. He initiated the writer's continuing interest in the interaction between theological formulations and moral styles.

Judy Provonsha Larson has made and continues to make the writer's life a joy by her wit and wisdom, laughter and love. She has infused every dimension of their joint pilgrimage with delight.

To these, and to many more, the writer is profoundly grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter   Page

CHAPTER I

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST NONCOMBATANCY IN

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

For several decades, Seventh-day Adventist leaders have advo-
cated a position with respect to participation in war which they call
"noncombatancy." According to many of adherents, this stance is not
to be equated with popular American understandings of conscientious
objection.[1] Instead, it possesses its own rationale and salient fea-
tures. One representative Seventh-day Adventist declaration describes
noncombatancy in the following fashion:

> In following Christ and His Word, we believe that we cannot
> take human life. This has led us to adopt the stand of noncom-
> batancy in regard to warfare. In this we are not pacifists. We
> willingly serve our country as good citizens, discharging our re-
> sponsibilities in the Armed forces, wearing the uniform, saluting
> the flag, obeying orders, asking only the privilege of obeying our
> conscience to God as supreme. This stand does not cause us to
> shrink from duty even on the battlefield, but we go into combat
> unarmed, to save life rather than take life.[2]

This chapter discusses certain documents which, in the writer's
opinion, accurately elucidate the components of Seventh-day Adventist
attitudes toward participation in war at various historical moments.

---

[1]"Seventh-day Adventists do not equate conscientious objection
with noncombatancy, for it has always been the desire of the denomina-
tion to maintain its religious principles and yet establish the value
of its war contribution." Eric D. Syme, "Seventh-day Adventist Con-
cepts on Church and State" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Ameri-
can University, 1969), p. 191.

[2]National Service Organization, *Questions and Answers for Those
Facing the Draft* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adven-
tists, n.d.), pp. 24, 25.

1

This means that the chapter makes no pretense of providing an exhaustive historical description of the subject under consideration, an analysis which is already available in the form of a doctoral dissertation.[3] This chapter has the more modest aim of placing the issues discussed in this study in historical perspective.

The chapter is divided into three major sections. The first section analyzes four of the most important Seventh-day Adventist documents on participation in war which emerged during the era of the American Civil War. This was a formative time for Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy. The second section discusses several of the documents which appeared in the first half of the twentieth century. This period of time, which was punctuated by World War I and World War II, forced Seventh-day Adventist leaders to implement their views in practical ways. The chapter's third section deals with some of the declarations which have appeared since World War II. These statements reveal Seventh-day Adventism's intentions to retain noncombatancy despite some criticism from within as well as without its own constituency. The summary describes some of the recurring characteristics of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy and delineates the questions which prompted the research entailed in the preparation of this dissertation.

---

[3]Roger G. Davis, "Conscientious Cooperators: The Seventh-day Adventists and Military Service, 1860-1945" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Washington University, 1970).

FORMULATION

On October 22, 1844, thousands[4] of Americans gathered in homes, churches, and other meeting places to participate in prayer, song, meditation, and fellowship as they awaited the literal appearance of Jesus Christ. The day passed from dawn and morning through noon and afternoon to dusk and midnight before these persons "finally accepted the fact that Christ would not be coming that day."[5] Within twenty-four hours, these followers of William Miller, a skeptical farmer, constable, justice of the peace, deputy sheriff, and soldier turned fervent believer, expositor, and proclaimer,[6] fell from the "heights of happiness and hope" to the "depths of deepest disappointment."[7]

Most of the Millerites repudiated their eschatological expectations and returned to the affairs of everyday life. A few decided, however, to continue their fellowship despite their disappointment. These persons formed a variety of organizations.[8] One

---

[4]"Probably well over fifty thousand people in the United States became convinced that time would run out in 1844, while a million or more of their fellows were skeptically expectant." Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-Over District* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965), p. 287.

[5]Davis, p. 23.

[6]*Ibid.*, pp. 9-29.

[7]Francis D. Nichol, *The Midnight Cry* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1944), p. 247.

[8]Davis, pp. 24, 25.

of these ex-Millerite assocations eventually assumed the name "Seventh-day Adventist." Unlike some other organizations which developed out of the Millerite movement, Seventh-day Adventism has consistently refused to set another date for the actualization of the *parousia*.[9] And yet it has continued to emphasize the continuing significance of Christian hope. It has also attempted to bear witness to the joys it experiences in celebrating the Sabbath on the seventh day of each week. Hence the name "Seventh-day Adventist." In less than one hundred fifty years, this religious manifestation has grown from a forty-member congregation located in Washington, New Hampshire[10] to a two-million member denomination engaging in evangelistic, educational, and medical endeavors in the entire world.

"The Nation"

Many of the first Seventh-day Adventists tended to be pacifistic in their attitudes toward participation in war. When the American Civil War began, these persons usually refrained from enlisting in the Union's army. At first, this position caused the Adventists little or no hardship because the Union's army was manned primarily by volunteers. As the war progressed, however, conscription laws began to be considered by legislatures. This development evoked a heated discussion among Seventh-day Adventists as to whether or not they should submit to the draft if conscription laws were enacted.

---

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 25.   [10]*Ibid.*, p. 26.

On August 12, 1862, the *Review and Herald*, one of Adventism's most important periodicals, published an editorial by James White entitled "The Nation."

White initiated his argument reminding his readers that the *Review and Herald* was opposed to slavery. He stated that slavery is "the darkest and most damning sin upon this nation," and that he knew of "not one man among Seventh-day Adventists who has the least sympathy for secession."[11]

White then provided two explanations as to why, despite their opposition to slavery and the South's secession, Seventh-day Adventists did not usually enlist in the Union's army. In his first explanation, White suggested that it was useless to fight for the elimination of slavery because he foresaw "the continuation of slavery, down to the end of all earthly governments,"[12] that is, until the *parousia*.[13] He based this prediction upon the fact that the *Apocalypse*, traditionally attributed to St. John, pictures bond-men as well as free-men calling "on rocks and mountains to hide them from the presence of the Lord."[14] In his second explanation, White reminded his readers that Seventh-day

---

[11]James White, "The Nation," *Review and Herald* (August 12, 1862), 84.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]"It appears that this argument, which infuriated the staunch abolitionist Adventists, would better have served the Adventist apology if it has been omitted; since better reasons existed for Adventist absenteeism from recruitment calls." Davis, p. 57.

[14]James White, "The Nation."

Adventists emphasized the normative significance of the decalogue and that it is often difficult for persons participating in war to celebrate the Sabbath and to refrain from destroying human life.

In his third move, White shifted the ground of moral responsibility from the individual Christian to the governments which enact conscription laws.

> But in the case of drafting, the government assumes the responsibility of the violation of the law of God, and it would be madness to resist. He who would resist until, in the administration of military law, he was shot down, goes too far, we think, in taking the responsibility of suicide.[15]

In his final sentences, White praised the government of the United States of America as the "best government under heaven"[16] despite the blight of slavery. This led him to conclude that:

> Those who are loyal to the government of Heaven, true to the constitution and laws of the Ruler of the universe, are the last men to 'sneak' off to Canada, or to Europe, or to stand trembling in their shoes for fear of a military draft...The Lord God omnipotent reigneth. He has the nation in his hand, and will order events for his glory, and the best good of his loyal people.[17]

James White's essay is important because it is one of the earliest statements on participation in war by a Seventh-day Adventist official. It is also important because it evoked a storm of controversy which, though painful to White and his associates, eventually contributed to the solidification of Adventist views on the subject. Its greatest importance resides, however, in the fact that the essay embodies several of the features of Seventh-day Adventist views on

---

[15]*Ibid.*   [16]*Ibid.*

[17]*Ibid.*

participation in war which often reappeared in the following years. These characteristics are significant enough to be listed at this juncture.

First, "The Nation" contains a patriotic attitude toward the government of the United States of America in general as well as a sympathetic orientation toward the Union's expressed rationale for waging war in particular. Second, the essay contains a pessimistic interpretation of human history as well as a juridical understanding of human morality. Third, the essay's explicit patriotism and implicit militarism on the one hand, and its pessimism and juridicism on the other hand, merge in such a fashion that the implied conclusion is that Seventh-day Adventists should not enlist in the armed forces nor refuse to participate in military life if they have no other legal alternative. Fourth, the suggestion is made that in such cases wherein a Christian is conscripted into military service against his own moral scruples, the government assumes the moral responsibility for any violation of principle. Fifth, this conclusion is fortified by an appeal to the New Testament passage which declares "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."[18]

"The Rebellion"

James White's essay evoked a storm of protest from those

---

[18]Matthew 22:21.

Seventh-day Adventists who, on previous occasions, had suggested that they would rather die than submit to any conscription law. The reaction was so intense that a notice appeared in a later issue of the *Review and Herald* stating that James White would be unable to meet certain appointments "in consequence of the sickly season, war excitement, fear of the Indians, excited feelings over our article entitled, 'The Nation,' and the General Conference so near."[19] In January of 1863, Ellen Gould White, wife of James White and one of early Seventh-day Adventism's most prolific writers, entered the discussion with pen in hand.

Ellen White's essay was entitled "The Rebellion." It began with a call for humility, calmness, reasonable reflection, and informed balance. She declared that those

> who have been forward to talk so decidedly about refusing to obey
> a draft, do not understand what they are talking about. Should
> they really be drafted, and, refusing to obey, be threatened with
> imprisonment, torture, or death, they would shrink, and then find
> that they had not prepared themselves for such an emergency. They
> would not endure the trial of their faith. What they thought to
> be faith was only fanatical presumption.[20]

She then attacked the institution of slavery. She began her offensive in a general way by comparing the reality of slavery in the United States with the ethical implications of the classical Christian doctrines of redemption and creation:

---

[19]W. C. White, D. E. Robinson, and A. L. White, "The Spirit of Prophecy and Military Service" (Washington: The Ellen G. White Estate of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1956), p. 9.

[20]Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1948), I, 357.

Christ died for the whole human family, whether white or black. God has made man a free moral agent, whether white or black. The institution of slavery does away with this, and permits man to exercise over his fellow-man a power which God has never granted him, and which belongs alone to God.[21]

Ellen White continued this same line of thought in more specific ways by including in her essay a portion of a letter she had written to a Seventh-day Adventist who, apparently, was sympathetic with the institution of slavery. After a substantial argument against slavery, she spelled out the alternatives before the erring Adventist. Unless he changed his viewpoint, declared Ellen White, "it will be the duty of God's people to publicly withdraw their sympathy and fellowship from you."[22]

Given her antagonisms against slavery, one might think that Ellen White would have been sympathetic with the Union's army. She was not. She declared that Seventh-day Adventists

cannot engage in this perplexing war, for it is opposed to every principle of their faith. In the army they cannot obey the truth and at the same time obey the requirements of their officers. There would be continual violation of conscience.[23]

It must be kept in mind that Ellen White made this comment before the enactment of conscription laws. The thrust of her position was that Seventh-day Adventists should not volunteer for military duty because such action would entail grave violations of moral principle.[24]

---

[21]*Ibid.*, I, 358.　[22]*Ibid.*, I, 360.　[23]*Ibid.*, I, 361.

[24]"It must be recognized that Ellen White was speaking of the circumstances in connection with '*this* perplexing war'--the Civil War--at that period when military service was on an enlistment basis only, and there was no provision whatsoever for the convictions of individual conscience. White, Robinson, and White, p. 13.

Of what violations of conscience was Ellen White speaking? First, there was the problem of the Sabbath. From the earliest days of their fellowship, Seventh-day Adventists celebrated the Sabbath from sundown Friday to sundown Saturday. This is difficult, if not impossible, for those active in warfare.

An additional problem was that of the needless destruction of human life. Ellen White was convinced that grave and unwarranted atrocities were being committed by the Union's Army, especially its officers.

> Many officers have brutal passions, and as they are placed in authority they have good opportunity to act out their brutal natures. They tyrannize over those under them, as Southern masters tyrannize over their slaves.[25]

A third problem, however, in Ellen White's estimation, was the ambiguity of the Union's motives for waging war. She was certain that many Northerners had no genuine desire to free the slaves and that these persons were motivated, primarily, by economic and political considerations. Ellen White believed that these persons sanctioned war in order to preserve the status quo.

> Many professed Union men, holding important positions, are disloyal at heart. Their only object in taking up arms was to preserve the Union as it was, and slavery with it. They would heartily chain down the slave to his life of galling bondage, had they the privilege. Such have a strong degree of sympathy with the South. Blood has been poured like water, and for naught.[26]

James and Ellen White apparently agreed that to enlist in the Union's army was not advisable but that to resist conscription to the point of execution was not necessary. It seems important to note,

---

[25]Ellen White, I, 365.   [26]*Ibid.*, I, 367.

however, that Ellen White's "The Rebellion" was somewhat less sanguine about the Union's moral posture than was James White's "The Nation." It also seems important to note that Ellen White did not envision the existence of slavery until the end of human history as did James White.

"A Petition to Governor Blair"

On March 3, 1863, the Congress of the United States of America passed a national conscription law.[27] This legislation stipulated that draftees could avoid conscription by providing a substitute or by purchasing an exemption for three hundred dollars.[28] Apart from these "substitutionary" and "bounty" provisions, there were no grounds for exemption for those conscientiously opposed to participate in warfare.

In time, however, the enactment was amended so that those who were conscientious objectors could be drafted to serve in "noncombatant" capacities only. These persons "were to be assigned duty in hospitals or in caring for freedmen."[29] Eventually, the three hundred dollar exemption provision was restricted so that it was applicable only to those who were conscientious objectors. A conscientious objector could therefore either pay the exemption fee or submit to being drafted as a noncombatant.

In order to obtain recognition for Seventh-day Adventists preferring to be drafted as noncombatants, the Executive Committee of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists formulated a petition

---

[27]Davis, p. 79.   [28]*Ibid.*

[29]*Ibid.*, p. 83.

which it presented to Austin Blair, Governor of Michigan, on August 3, 1864.[30]

Several aspects of this petition seem worthy of attention. For one thing, the petition claims that Seventh-day Adventists are "rigidly antislavery, loyal to the government, and in sympathy with it against the rebellion."[31] It also claims, however, that

> The denomination of Christians calling themselves Seventh-day Adventists, taking the Bible as their rule of faith and practice, are unanimous in their views that its teachings are contrary to the spirit and practice of war; hence, they have ever been conscientiously opposed to bearing arms.[32]

Shortly thereafter, similar petitions were presented to the governors of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Pennsylvania as well as to various officers of the federal government in Washington, D. C. The result of these various petitions was that Seventh-day Adventists were given the legal option of serving in noncombatant capacities if and when they were drafted into the armed forces.

The conscription laws operative in the United States of America during the American Civil War, as eventually amended, provided that conscientious objectors could either pay a three hundred dollar exemption fee or serve in the Union's army in noncombatant capacities. No provisions were made, as far as the writer presently knows, for conscientious objectors to engage in alternative forms of civilian service

---

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 85.

[31]Francis M. Wilcox, *Seventh-day Adventists in Time of War* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1936), p. 58.

[32]*Ibid.*

in lieu of either paying the exemption fee or being conscripted as a noncombatant. This suggests that during the American Civil War, as far as the government was concerned, little or no difference existed between noncombatancy and other forms of conscientious objection to participation in war.

"Our Views of War"

In 1865, the *Review and Herald* published at least three resolutions from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists which are relevant to this chapter's inquiry. For one thing, it resolved to "request the Executive Committee of the General Conference to prepare an article for publication, setting forth our view of the teaching of Scripture on the subject of war."[33]

A second resolution attempted to formulate the views of Seventh-day Adventists regarding participation in war in one concise paragraph:

> Resolved, That we recognize civil government is ordained of God, that order, justice, and quiet may be maintained in the land; and that the people of God may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty. In accordance with this fact we acknowledge the justice of rendering tribute, custom, honor, and reverence to the civil power, as enjoined in the New Testament. While we thus cheerfully render to Caesar the things which the Scriptures show to be his, we are compelled to decline all participation in acts of war and bloodshed as being inconsistent with the duties enjoined upon us by our divine Master toward our enemies and toward all mankind.[34]

A third resolution declared that a certain pamphlet, entitled *Extracts from the Publications of Seventh-day Adventists Setting Forth*

---

[33]*Ibid.*, p. 24.   [34]*Ibid.*

Their Views of the Sinfulness of War, is "a truthful representation of the views held by us from the beginning of our existence as a people."[35] This tract, a compilation of letters, articles, and short essays is unified by its consistent condemnation of warfare. It includes, however, several different lines of argument. This reflects the fact that the various items included in the compilation were written by several persons rather than a single author.

At least six lines of argument can be identified in the pamphlet. Some claimed that the horrors of war being experienced in America were attributable to the institution of slavery. Others were concerned that in warfare the Christian community became "unlawfully wedded to the world."[36] There were some who were more concerned about the general moral collapse experienced by nations in time of war than the evil of war itself. Others condemned participation in war because they believed that Christians should not "meddle" in politics of any sort. Still other Seventh-day Adventists were concerned that some of the most important clergymen of their day no longer adhered to the claims of Christianity, as these Adventists understood them, with respect to participation in war. Such persons were appalled by a statement attributed to Henry Ward Beecher that it is "an everlasting

---

[35]*Ibid.*, p. 23.

[36]*Compilations of Extracts from the Publications of Seventh-day Adventists Setting Forth Their Views of the Sinfulness of War* (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publising Association, 1865), p. 6.

disgrace to shoot at a man and not hit him."[37] There were even those
who argued against war on economic grounds by estimating the cost, in
dollars and cents, of the various wars in Europe during the immediately
preceding years. It seems, however, that the most important single
argument against participation in war was the assertion that such ac-
tivity is contrary to the spirit of the Bible as personified in the
figure of Jesus of Nazereth.

One might do justice to the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventists
toward participation in war during the American Civil War if he made
three assertions. First, Seventh-day Adventists were sympathetic with
the Union against slavery and against the secession of the South. Sec-
ond, Seventh-day Adventists considered participation in war to be in-
consistent with their understandings of Christianity's moral impera-
tives. Third, Seventh-day Adventists were advised to refrain from
enlisting but to consent to being drafted to serve in noncombatant
capacities. It is important to remember, however, that there were
little or no provisions for conscientious objectors to engage in al-
ternative forms of civilian service.

Because the American Civil War ended soon after the Congress
of the United States enacted and amended the national conscription law,
"there were probably no more than some two hundred [Seventh-day Adven-
tist] men actually drafted as noncombatants before the war's end."[38]

---

[37]*Ibid.*, p. 13.   [38]Davis, p. 91.

IMPLEMENTATION

During the era of the American Civil War, Seventh-day Adventists discussed the morality of participating in war and eventually formulated a position which they called "noncombatancy." They did little, however, to implement their views beyond gaining governmental recognition of their convictions. This was so for at least two reasons. First, there were only about 4,000 Seventh-day Adventists in 1865.[39] The denomination was too small to need to devise programs to put noncombatancy into practice. Second, the Civil War ended before it became necessary for Seventh-day Adventism to implement its views on participation in war.

In the first half of the twentieth century, however, it became imperative for Seventh-day Adventist leaders to seek ways of implementing noncombatancy. World War I and World War II made it necessary to develop ways of making Adventism's views a realistic and possible option for Seventh-day Adventist young people. Also, by 1914, the denomination's membership stood at 125,000 persons.[40] It has been estimated that as many as 10,000 to 15,000 Seventh-day Adventists registered for conscription during World War I and that 12,000 Seventh-day Adventists actually served in the armed forces during World War II.[41]

In order to meet the pressing demands, several practical

---

[39]*Ibid.*, p. 102   [40]*Ibid.*

[41]*Ibid.*, pp. 124, 212.

measures were taken. Commissions were established on the General Conference level which were charged with the responsibility of caring for Seventh-day Adventists engaged in military service. Special funds were earmarked for the development of publications suitable for Adventist soldiers and for the development of sites suitable as rest and recreation centers for Adventist servicemen. Camp pastors were assigned the duty of serving the religious and social needs of Adventists located on various military bases.

Without a doubt, the most dramatic implementation of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy occurred in the emergence of the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps. As early as October 15, 1916, the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists passed a resolution recommending the establishment of programs at the denomination's colleges and hospitals to train young men in the "fundamental principles of nursing, and 'first aid' to the injured."[42] In 1918, the General Conference authorized $30,000.00 to be utilized in the development of training programs at the Washington Sanitarium and at the College of Medical Evangelists, located in Loma Linda, California, which would be capable of preparing young Seventh-day Adventists "for military medical service."[43]

Nine years later, a group of Adventist veterans of World War I met in Denver, Colorado, and formulated a recommendation that the denomination develop pre-induction training programs for young Seventh-day Adventists which would combine training in military drill with

---

[42]*Ibid.*, p. 110.   [43]*Ibid.*, p. 141.

instruction in medical service.[44] Although this recommendation was

vetoed, it embodied the wave of the future for in 1934, such a program

was initiated at Union College, a Seventh-day Adventist liberal arts

college located near Lincoln, Nebraska.[45] Two years later, a similar

program was begun in connection with the White Memorial Hospital lo-

cated in Los Angeles, California.[46] In October of 1939, the Autumn

Council of the General Conference voted to establish a commission which

would encourage, coordinate, and administer the development of the de-

nomination's preinduction military-medical programs by working "in all

possible harmony with the medical and other authorities of the National

Government."[47] A year later, in July of 1940, the numerous programs

were gathered under the rubric "Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet

Corps."[48] Eventually, a General Conference resolution recommended the

establishment of a "Medical Cadete Corps" to provide military and medi-

cal training for Seventh-day Adventist women similar to the programs

already devised for the denomination's men.[49]

In 1941, 5,000 young Seventh-day Adventists were members of

the Medical Cadet Corps. By 1943, this number had jumped to 12,000.[50]

Thus, "the Seventh-day Adventist Church had set in motion the organi-

zational machinery for giving its youth the highest degree of medical-

military training that could be found outside the United States Army

Medical Corps."[51]

---

[44]*Ibid.*, p. 169, 170. [45]*Ibid.*, p. 179. [46]*Ibid.*, pp. 181-183.

[47]*Ibid.*, p. 186. [48]*Ibid.*, pp. 193, 194. [49]*Ibid.*, p. 206.

[50]*Ibid.*, p. 204. [51]*Ibid.*, p. 187.

It has been suggested that Seventh-day Adventism's financial investments in preinduction military-medical programs for its youth were "truly unique in the history of the American churches."[52] Whether or not these investments were unique, it cannot be denied that they successfully implemented Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy by making it possible for Adventist draftees to be assigned military duties in medical capacities.

"Pronouncements," "Resolutions," "Letters"

In April of 1917, the executive committee of the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists, meeting in Huntsville, Alabama, drafted and adopted a resolution concerning participation in war. This resolution, or "Pronouncement Concerning Bearing Arms," quoted and re-affirmed the resolution passed by the 1865 General Conference session. In addition, it appealed to the authorities governing the United States of America to recognize the convictions of Seventh-day Adventists so that they not be required to violate their understandings of "the law of God as contained in the decalogue, interpreted in the teachings of Christ, and exemplified in His life."[53]

Approximately one year later, in July of 1918, the Midsummer Council of the General Conference met in Washington, D.C., and passed several sets of resolutions which illustrate the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventists toward participation in war during the era of World War I.

52*Ibid.*, p. 141.   53Wilcox, p. 113.

The first cluster of resolutions focused on the problem of utilizing the nation's resources in times of war. It made specific recommendations to the appropriate organizations encouraging the denomination's institutional facilities to cooperate with the government's conservation programs.[54]

A second set of resolutions restated the loyalty of American Seventh-day Adventists in the United States to their government. Among other things, these resolutions of loyalty declared that

> While ever in our history we have been of noncombatant principles by religious conviction, we believe equally, by the same religious conviction, that we should render to our government the lines of noncombatant service as defined by our President in his declaration of March 20, 1918.[55]

In addition to the "Huntsville Pronouncement" and the resolutions passed in Washington, D.C., in 1918, there are some letters written by Seventh-day Adventist leaders to the denomination's soldiers. These letters are of particular interest because they were published in the denomination's periodicals and, at times, printed as leaflets to be given to the church's youth. One such letter was written by a minister named F. M. Wilcox. Its tone can be ascertained from the following selection:

> You may carry Christ with you to the camp, to the field, to the earth's remotest bounds. You may find in your loneliness, in your trials, in times of imminent danger, a communion with Him, sweeter and more satisfying than any communion you might enjoy with earthly friends.[56]

Another Adventist minister wrote and published a letter

---

[54]*Ibid.*, pp. 138, 139.   [55]*Ibid.*, p. 143.

[56]*Ibid.*, p. 236.

encouraging the denomination's young men to remember the President of

the United States in their personal devotions. He declared that the

President was "a finished scholar, a diplomat, a man of highest cul-

ture, a man who believes in God and in prayer" who "needs prayer more

than censure or criticism."[57]

"Our Youth in Time of War"

In 1934, the Executive Committee of the General Conference

approved a document prepared by an Adventist minister of some standing,

J. P. Neff, "for the express purpose of helping some of our young men

in future contingencies that might arise."[58]

This statement, which was published and distributed in leaflet

form among Seventh-day Adventists in the United States, was significant

for its call for preparation for the eventuality of war and for its

outspoken criticism of pacifism.[59]

Neff suggested several lines of work for which young Seventh-

day Adventists should prepare in order to qualify for noncombatant

military service. He called particular attention to medicine, nursing,

---

[57]*Ibid.*, pp. 241, 243.   [58]*Ibid.*, p. 383.

[59]"He labeled pacifists as advocates of 'peace at any price;'
he criticized the conscientious objectors because of their refusal to
render any service, including medical; and he denounced the antimili-
tarists because of their disrespect for 'our' uniforms and flag...
The pamphlet, however, marked a distinct departure for the church.
Never before had the church attacked other groups over their conscien-
tious convictions and this fact led to a quick denunciation of the
pamphlet by pacifistic Adventists. Also, a large number of noncom-
batant members felt the church should tend to its own affairs and not
become embroiled in public debates with 'outside' pacifists." Davis,
p. 175.

cooking, first aid, dentistry, embalming, band direction, accounting, secretarial service, printing, electrical engineering, mechanical work, carpentry, surveying, tailoring, and shoe repairing. He ended his appeal with a plea for haste: "Set yourselves to the task without delay. There is no time to waste. Only a brief time remains, we think, in which to prepare to meet the impending clash of the nations."[60]

Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government

On September 25, 1940, the Executive Committee of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists met in Takoma Park, Washington, D.C. As part of their deliberations, they authorized a statement on participation in war. This is one of the most important Seventh-day Adventist declarations on the subject. As one compares it with those statements authorized by the General Conference Executive Committee on previous occasions, at least eight things come to mind.

First, there is the continued avowal of loyalty to the proper and legitimate roles of government in general and the government of the United States in particular.

Second, although the document does insist that government must be resisted when it demands something contrary to the will of God, its mood tends, in the writer's estimation, to undergird extensions rather than limitations of governmental authority. The two texts printed on

---

[60]Wilcox, p. 395.

the leaflet's cover are Romans 13:1 ("Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.") and Matthew 22:21 ("Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."). Furthermore, it quotes several of the most pro-government statements penned by Seventh-day Adventists in the nineteenth century with little or no reference to the fact that early Adventists believed that "bad laws" should be resisted.

Third, this pamphlet explicates in greater detail the reasons why Seventh-day Adventists understood themselves to be noncombatants. It quotes several passages of scripture including: (1) John 18:36 ("If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."), (2) Matthew 5:44 ("Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you..."), (3) Luke 9:56 ("The Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."), (4) Matthew 5:39 ("Resist not evil..."), and (5) Romans 8:9 ("If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.").

Fourth, it appeals to the traditional doctrine of the two-spheres in order to limit governmental intrusions into religious affairs:

> We are therefore forced to the conclusion that the jurisdiction of human government is limited to the sphere of civil relations, to the decision of questions governing the relation of man to his fellow man. There is a sphere—the personal relation of man to his Maker—into which civil government has no God-given or Heaven-ordained right to intrude.[61]

---

[61]National Service Organization, *Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.), p. 6.

Fifth, the notion that war is unavoidable given the condition of humanity was given authority and wide publicity. The 1940 declaration quoted with approval an earlier statement which had said that "while recognizing that warfare is unavoidable in maintaining civil government in a world of sin, noncombatants conscientiously object to taking human life."[62]

Sixth, the document drove a wedge between noncombatancy and pacifism and explicitly accepted noncombatancy and implicitly rejected pacifism. It described pacifism and contrasted it to noncombatancy in a manner which, in the writer's opinion, was not accurate:

> Noncombatancy is not pacifism. Pacifism maintains substantial and powerful organization which agitates against war. Noncombatancy maintains no organizations, carries on no agitation, supports no propaganda, appeals for no members. It merely maintains Christian faith. Noncombatancy is not conscientious objection to war service but maintains the attitude and conviction that war does not change the individual Christian's obligation of obedience to God.[63]

Seventh, the guiding principle utilized in the 1940 declaration seems to have been that one should participate in war as fully as his Christian convictions will possibly permit him. "We should study, not how little we can do for suffering humanity in times of national emergency, but rather how much."[64]

Eighth, the 1940 document stipulates that individual Seventh-day Adventists must come to personal conclusions on the issue of participation in war. "The Church," it declared, "does not attempt to

---

[62]*Ibid.*, p. 11.   [63]*Ibid.*, p. 18.

[64]*Ibid.*, p. 22.

dictate to its members individually, but each person must stand upon his own conscientious convictions."[65]

Why Seventh-day Adventists Are Noncombatants

On October 11, 1943, "after the subject had been given thorough study over a period of many months,"[66] the Executive Committee of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists approved another statement on the issue of participation in war.

Its title might cause one to expect that this would be the most complete exposition of the subject ever published by the denomination. In fact, this document seems to have been written to answer objections from those who pointed out that the Old Testament often pictures ancient Israel engaging in war under Yahweh's direction. The 1943 declaration suggested that ancient Israel seems to have understood herself, at times, as a theocracy but that the United States of America understands itself to be a democracy. It also suggested that today "God does not command the armies of the earth."[67]

When one reflects upon the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventists in the United States of America toward participation in war during the first half of the twentieth century, three things seem evident. First, the guiding principle seems to have shifted from how little

---

[65]*Ibid.*, p. 12.

[66]National Service Organization, *Why Seventh-day Adventists Are Noncombatants* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, c. 1943), p. 2.

[67]*Ibid.*, p. 10.

Seventh-day Adventists can participate in war given a particular legal context, to how much they can participate in war given their religious convictions. Second, this modification in the basic question seems to have entailed modifications in action. During the era of World War II, Seventh-day Adventist leadership deliberately drove a wedge between pacifism and noncombatancy. They called pacifism "conscientious objection" and noncombatancy "conscientious cooperation" despite the fact that both stances seemed to have had moral scruples about participating in war.[68] Third, although there seems to have been some subtle and significant shifts of emphasis, as just indicated, Seventh-day Adventists in the first half of the twentieth century understood themselves to be in direct continuity and complete harmony with the position adopted by their nineteenth century forefathers.

RETENTION

Seldom, if ever, has Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy escaped criticism and censure. Because it is more militaristic than some pacifists would like it to be and because it is more pacifistic than some militarists would like it to be, it has often been attacked. In its recommendations that persons refrain from enlisting in the armed forces but submit to being drafted into noncombatant military roles, it stands between militarism and pacifism and, apparently, is often unsatisfactory to both.

---

[68]Davis, pp. 201, 202.

In recent years, the critics of Adventist noncombatancy have not been silent. There is, in fact, significant evidence suggesting that since World War II the trenchantness, if not the numerousness, of criticism directed toward Adventism's stance on participation in war has increased. This most recent criticism has come from several different quarters within and without the denomination.

To begin with, there have been those who have wished that the denomination was more sympathetic with those opting for alternative forms of civilian service in lieu of noncombatant as well as combatant military duty. "Could we," asked an Adventist historian, "have both enlarged our witness and made a significantly better world by a firm, uncompromising position such as Quakers would take?"[69] Another Adventist professor compared a Seventh-day Adventist noncombatant serving as a medic on a battlefield to a physician who accepts a position at a brothel "with the understanding that his main function there would be to cure his patients of venereal disease so that they could get back to their 'jobs' as soon as possible." He also asked:

> What do our medics sent to the battlefield do but bring healing to our wounded in order to get them back into action—to enable them, that is, to kill, since killing is the soldier's main purpose?[70]

Others have desired that Adventism favorably consider some contemporary variation of the traditional just-war doctrine. In 1969,

---

[69]Frederick G. Hoyt, "The Dehumanizing Effects of War," *Spectrum*, II (Summer 1970), 52.

[70]Emanuel G. Fenz, "The Case for Conscientious Objection," *Spectrum*, I (Winter 1969), 44.

one such advocate suggested that "the most immediate concern of the church should be agitation for a law"[71] which would legalize conscientious objection to particular wars. This Adventist outlined his dissatisfaction with his denomination's recommendations in the following fashion:

> My objection to it is that it rides the fence. Indiscriminate noncombatancy simply avoids some important ethical issues—such as whether a war is just or not. The conscientious cooperator fancies that he is doing all that is required of him simply by (a) heeding the call of his country, no matter what war it has gotten itself into, and (b) refusing to kill the enemy.[72]

Still others have criticized the militaristic overtones of Adventist noncombatancy in general and the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps in particular. Such persons could, it seems, be content with noncombatancy as a denominationally recommended stance if this stance was understood as a form of conscientious objection to war; a particular sort of demonstration for peace. This would, in actuality, seem to bridge the chasm some denominational leaders have placed between pacifism and noncombatancy. An ethicist at Andrews University's Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary has suggested that

> Some noncombatants might even see themselves as Activist Pacifists who are not simply healing wounded individuals but nonviolently protesting against the corporate evil of government... To those who argue that opponents of war should act outside the military, the noncombatant replies that he would demonstrate against war right in the midst of the military. He will not sit at home

---

[71]Chuck Scriven, "The Case for Selective Nonpacifism," *Spectrum*, I (Winter 1969), 44.

[72]*Ibid.*, p. 43.

answering the phone in some office, satisfied that he has ful-
filled his moral obligation by refusing to wear an army uniform.[73]

Adventist noncombatancy has also been indirectly censured by
those who have criticized the denomination for its alleged lack of
social, economic, and political concern. An Adventist political sci-
entist admitted that many of his fellow church members "suggest that
active concern with public policy is inappropriate for a Christian."[74]
He asserted, however, that "war is a morally repugnant and an inef-
fective means of settling national conflicts" and that if the Seventh-
day Adventist clergymen "were more alert to the correlation between
certain broad public endeavors and established Christian values, this
would represent no insignificant increase in their enlightenment."[75]

Finally, Seventh-day Adventism's involvement in "Project White-
coat" has evoked severe criticism from without as well as from within
the denomination. Since 1954, at least 1,500 Adventist servicemen
have, with the direct approval of (if not encouragement) the denomina-
tion's leaders, freely presented themselves as subjects for the
testing of "vaccines for highly infectious diseases"[76] by volunteering
to participate in "Project Whitecoat," an endeavor of the United States
military. Because of the project's proximity to Fort Detrick, the

---

[73]Roy Branson, "What is the Meaning of Noncombatancy?"
(Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University, c. 1970), p. 19.

[74]Reo M. Christenson, "The Church and Public Policy," *Spectrum*,
II (Summer 1970), 23.

[75]*Ibid.*, p. 28.

[76]Davis, p. 223.

alleged "headquarters for research and development of biological warfare"[77] weapons, it has been repeatedly asserted that the denomination is cooperating in the development of sinister weapons. In 1969, a task force was established by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to investigate the nature of the research. This investigation which, according to one source, "consisted of a visit to Fort Detrick by an eight-man subcommittee for an interview with Colonel Crozier and his staff,"[78] found no connection between "Project Whitecoat" and "the government's testing of biological weapons."[79] One Congressman has stated, however, that in his opinion "the Seventh-day Adventists are being duped."[80]

Despite the criticism which has been leveled at Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy from these various sources, there is no evidence that the stance will be scuttled by the denomination's leaders. Instead, each of the documents discussed in the following paragraphs reveal the intentions of Adventism's leaders to retain the denomination's traditional position on participation in warfare.

"The Relationship of Seventh-day Adventists
to Civil Government and War"

On June 5, 1954, the General Conference of Seventh-day

---

[77]Martin D. Turner, "Project Whitecoat," *Spectrum*, II (Summer 1970), 55.

[78]*Ibid.*, p. 62.   [79]Davis, p. 224.

[80]Turner, p. 65.

Adventists, meeting in San Francisco, California, adopted a resolution

on participation in war. This short, almost terse, statement is im-

portant for at least three reasons. First, "The Relationship of

Seventh-day Adventists to Civil Government and War" is the only pro-

nouncement on the subject which, up to that time, had been approved

by the full session of the General Conference which includes delegates

from all parts of the world. The previous declarations had been ap-

proved by various subcommittees of the General Conference. Second, the

declaration builds upon an exposition of the "two divinely established

institutions, the church and civil governments" with an emphasis upon

the Christian's obligation to "put God first."[81] Third, the document

describes noncombatancy in carefully worded prose in an attempt to re-

frain from offending the leaders of any contemporary government.

> In their accepting of the obligation of citizenship, as well as its
> benefits, their loyalty to government requires them to serve the
> state in any noncombatant capacity, civil or military, in war or
> peace, in uniform or out of it, which will contribute to saving
> life, asking only that they may serve in those capacities which
> do not violate their conscientious convictions.[82]

"Noncombatancy and Governmental Relationships"

A syllabus prepared by the current director of the National

Service Organization, the department of the General Conference of

Seventh-day Adventists responsible for the denomination's relationship

to military matters, contains a section entitled "Noncombatancy and

Governmental Relationships." This is of particular interest because

---

[81]Davis, p. 236.   [82]*Ibid.*

it outlines the instruction currently given to enrollees in Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps.

"Noncombatancy and Governmental Relationships" begins with a discussion of the Old Testament which develops the principle that "taking of human life, except in obedience to God while so doing, is disobedience to God and forbidden."[83] It then turns to the New Testament and, after some discussion, comes to the conclusion that "the Christian is to obey the nation, not only because the nation can punish for disobedience, but because it is his sacred duty to obey--'for conscience sake.'"[84]

What if, however, a conflict develops between a Christian's refusal to take human life and a nation's command that the Christian engage in warfare? "Noncombatancy and Governmental Relationships" delineates these three points:

1. Man is a citizen of his earthly country and as such has responsibilities and loyalties to it.

2. The man who has experienced the new birth is also a citizen of the heavenly kingdom of God, and has responsibilities and loyalties to it.

3. In the case of any conflict between his two responsibilities or loyalties, the heavenly citizenship is higher in importance than his earthly citizenship.[85]

When these three principles are applied to the current American

---

[83]Clark Smith, "Character Guidance Studies for the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps" (Washington: National Service Organization of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.), pp. 7, 8.

[84]*Ibid.*, p. 10.   [85]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

scene, the conclusion is that Seventh-day Adventists can "come nearest to solving the dilemma by taking the stand of noncombatancy. We neither take up arms at the command of our country nor are we pacifists (in the generally accepted understanding of that term.)"[86]

"A Defense of the Adventist Position"

It has been suggested that in recent years Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy has been subjected to a significant amount of criticism. This does not mean, however, that the stance has had no informed defenders. One champion of the denomination's traditional position is a young historian who teaches at Andrews University, Donald R. McAdams.

Predictably, McAdams develops his point of view by appealing to history. He begins with the assumption that Christians should avoid participating in warfare "if avoidance is possible."[87] He goes on to argue, however, that in today's industrial and highly interdependent society it is impossible to refrain from having a part in warfare to the degree that it was possible in previous eras. Since, today, there is no way completely to avoid contributing to the nation's war effort, one should do so "in a humane and compassionate way."[88] Noncombatancy, in McAdam's opinion, is an attempt to do this.

He frankly admits that, interpreted in this fashion,

---

[86]*Ibid.*, p. 12.

[87]Donald R. McAdams, "A Defense of the Adventist Position," *Spectrum*, I (Winter 1969), 44.

[88]*Ibid.*, p. 47.

noncombatancy is a "compromise" which, if it were adopted by every person, is "even absurd."[89] He insists, however, that it "is a compromise that works"[90] for Seventh-day Adventism which is "and always will be a small minority of this country."[91]

Military Service and You

Historian Roger Davis has suggested that each generation of Seventh-day Adventists "has questioned the moral value of noncombatancy" and that the denomination's leaders have repeatedly established committees "with the intention of providing a better reason for maintaining the noncombatant policy."[92] One of the most recent of these committees was established in February of 1970. After considerable deliberation, the committee authorized the publication of a statement entitled *Military Service and You*. This pamphlet is important because it is the most recent official Seventh-day Adventist statement on the moral issues entailed in participation in war.

At first reading, *Military Service and You* seems to be very similar to several of its most immediate predecessors. It builds upon an exposition of the separate but equally legitimate functions of church and state. It reiterates the principle that Christians should obey their governments unless such obedience causes one to violate his understanding of God's will. Reminding the reader that combatant military duty often clashes with Adventist interpretations of the fourth

---

[89]*Ibid.*, p. 48.   [90]*Ibid.*

[91]*Ibid.*   [92]Davis, p. 223.

and sixth commandments in Exodus 20, the pamphlet discourages the denomination's youth from enlisting in the armed forces. If drafted, however, the document recommends that American Adventists enter military life under the noncombatant (I-A-0) classification.

Yet, close examination reveals, in the writer's opinion, that subtle but extremely important differences do exist between *Military Service and You* and its most immediate predecessors.

For one thing, the document evinces a softening in tone. Unlike *Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government*, for instance, this pamphlet contains no implicit denunciation of pacifism. Neither does it strongly reprove those who understand themselves to be conscientious objectors to particular wars. Even when it discusses enlisting in the armed forces, the document carefully suggests that this should be done "only in accordance with your conscientious convictions" and that "your church does not counsel this course of action."[93]

Military Service and You also details with greater explicitness than some of its predecessors that each individual Seventh-day Adventist must come to his own conclusions regarding the morality of participating in warfare. Although the denomination has never disfellowshipped anyone for rejecting noncombatancy, it has not always emphasized the importance of personal freedom and responsibility as forcefully as does this document.

---

[93]National Service Organization, *Military Service and You* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1972), pp. 2, 4.

Finally, in the writer's opinion, *Military Service and You* evinces a denominational disavowal of political concern. It will be recalled that from their earliest days Seventh-day Adventists formulated noncombatancy on the basis of expositions of the separate realms and functions of church and state. This was done, if the writer's understanding is accurate, in order to specify that the denomination considered governmental intrusion into some areas of religious concern to be illegitimate. In *Military Service and You*, however, it is possible to see the converse inference, that contemporary denominational leaders consider the intrusion of religion into some areas of governmental concern to be illegitimate:

> We have just noted the relationship between church and state. They occupy and administer different areas. When either the church or the state reaches across into the realm of the other, a conflict develops. War is an instrument in the hand of the government. Your church believes that it is not its prerogative to make a judgment as to whether or not nations should enter into war, whether general or particular.[94]

> Your Church leaves with the administering agents of the government the decision on how to use its police powers. When warfare breaks out your Church believes it should make no comment on the justness of that conflict.[95]

In the writer's opinion, *Military Service and You* goes further than any other official Seventh-day Adventist document on participation in war in its attempts to divorce the moral issues involved in personal participation in war from the moral issues entailed in national initiation and continuation of warfare.

In summary, it seems possible to say three things about the

---

[94]*Ibid.*, p. 4.   [95]*Ibid.*, p. 5.

most recent Seventh-day Adventist declarations on warfare. First, despite a significant amount of criticism, Seventh-day Adventist leaders have decided to retain noncombatancy. Second, the denomination seems to be retreating from some of the most forceful criticisms it made earlier in the twentieth century regarding stances other than non-combatancy. Third, Seventh-day Adventist leaders have explicated their understandings of the proper relationships between church and state in such a way that they feel prohibited from making any statements regarding national engagements in warfare.

SUMMARY AND REMAINING QUESTIONS

During the era of the American Civil War, Seventh-day Adventists came to the conclusion, after much discussion, that they should refrain from enlisting in the armed forces but, if drafted, they should consent to participate in military life in those capacities which did not require them personally to engage in the direct destruction of human life. The necessity of implementing this stance, which came to be called "noncombatancy," did not occur until the first half of the twentieth century when World War I and World War II forced the denomination to put its views into practice in tangible ways. Foremost among the denomination's various measures was the gradual emergence of the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps, a pre-induction training program which combined practice in military drill with instruction in medical service. Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy has always been criticized but in recent years this criticism has been especially trenchant. Seventh-day Adventist leaders have decided, however, to

retain the denomination's traditional position on participation in war.

What are some of the recurring characteristics of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy? It has always entailed the suggestion that Adventists not enlist in the armed forces. It has always suggested that if one has no other legal alternative, he should consent to participate in those aspects of military life which will not require him personally to participate in the direct destruction of human life. It has often evinced an ambivalent attitude toward war itself. It seems always to have implied that individual Christians cannot take human life but, at times, it has also implied that it may be necessary for governments to engage in warfare. In the twentieth century it has attempted to distinguish between itself and pacifism by calling itself "conscientious cooperation" and by calling pacifism "conscientious objection." It has always declared itself to be loyal to government in general and has often been sympathetic with the government's declared reasons for waging war in particular.

It has been suggested that, despite a significant amount of criticism, Seventh-day Adventist leaders have decided to retain noncombatancy. It is possible to wonder, however, if the ministers of the denomination in the United States are satisfied with the positions taken by their administrators. In this regard, four questions come to mind:

1. Are there any significant patterns in the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist clergymen in the United States of America toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism,

and absolute pacifism?[96]

2. Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of these stances and their attitudes regarding the morality of these stances?

3. Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' theological opinions and their attitudes?

4. Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' personal characteristics and their attitudes?

These are the questions which prompted the research entailed in the preparation of this dissertation. The following chapter will describe the procedures utilized in the search for answers to these four questions.

---

[96]The dissertation's use of the terms "combatancy," "noncombatancy," "selective pacifism," and "absolute pacifism" will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND LIMITATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures which were utilized in the preparation of this dissertation. The chapter begins with a discussion of the items which were considered before the administration of the survey. The second section describes the survey itself. The final section of the chapter discusses the procedures used in the collation, interpretation, and evaluation of the data. At various germane points, the chapter stipulates the limitations of the utilized procedures.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

This section of the present chapter discusses those items which were considered before the administration of the survey. It concentrates upon the specifying questions, working definitions, and methods of questionnaire construction.

Specifying Questions

It is customary for students to stipulate the hypotheses they wish to test before they initiate their research projects. Because the research entailed in the preparation of this dissertation was intended to be primarily exploratory, it seemed desirable to stipulate questions to be answered in lieu of hypotheses to be tested. The following questions were formulated:

40

1. Are there any significant patterns in the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist clergymen in the United States of America toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism?

2. Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of these stances and their attitudes regarding the morality of these stances?

3. Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' theological opinions and their attitudes?

4. Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' personal characteristics and their attitudes?

These four questions constituted the project's specifying questions.

Working Definitions

The specifying questions employed the terms "combatancy," "non-combatancy," "selective pacifism," and "absolute pacifism." It seemed advisable to formulate "working definitions" of these terms and to include the definitions in the questionnaire in the hopes that their presence would increase the reliability of the ministers' responses. The following definitions were formulated:

Combatancy: The willingness to participate in any aspect of any war in which one's country may engage.

Noncombatancy: The unwillingness to participate in those aspects of war which entail the direct destruction of human life.

Selective Pacifism: The unwillingness to participate in any aspect of those wars one considers unwarranted.

Absolute Pacifism: The unwillingness to participate in any aspect of any war in which one's country may engage.

These definitions had the sole purpose of increasing the reliability of the ministers' responses to the questionnaire. Because they make no attempt to do full justice to any or all of the four stances,

they are of little or no value apart from their intended purpose.

Questionnaire Construction

The writer initiated the process of questionnaire construction by devising, evaluating, and revising several forms. The instrument eventually developed was presented to the chairman of his advisory committee for criticism and evaluation. Several revisions ensued and, in due time, the writer and the chairman of his advisory committee finalized upon a form which was the result of their cooperative effort.

This tentative questionnaire was then submitted to three groups of persons noted for their expertise in either Christian ethics or the methodology of questionnaire construction or both. One such collective consisted of the members of a School of Theology at Claremont seminar in "Christian Faith and International Relations" led in the spring of 1972 by Professor Harvey Seifert. A second group included those theological professors, hospital chaplains, and parish ministers who met regularly in 1972 for lunch and dialogue under the direction of Professor Jack Provonsha at Loma Linda University, a Seventh-day Adventist institution. A third collective consisted of a variety of persons scattered throughout the United States who received copies of the tentative questionnaire by mail. Helpful criticisms were returned by Betty Stirling, Professor of Sociology at Loma Linda University; Theadore J. Chamberlain, Instructor in Sociology at Loma Linda University; Roy Branson, Assistant Professor of Christian Ethics at Andrews University; Ernest Bursey, Instructor in Religion at San Pasqual Academy; and Chuck Scriven, associate editor of *Insight*, a Seventh-day Adventist

periodical for young adults. The critical remarks were studied and the questionnaire was revised in order to incorporate as many of the suggestions as possible.

In its final form, the questionnaire consisted of thirty questions mimeographed upon five sheets of white paper. The questions were divided three ways. The largest section of the questionnaire included questions regarding the ministers' attitudes toward combatancy, non-combatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism as well as questions regarding the ministers' personal positions and their views with respect to denominational policy. A second section inquired into certain of the ministers' theological opinions and a third attempted to gather data with respect to the ministers' personal characteristics. The section focusing upon the ministers' theological opinions occupied the first page and a half. The section investigating the ministers' attitudes occupied the middle pages. The section of the questionnaire dealing with the ministers' personal characteristics occupied the last page and a half.

THE SURVEY

The survey constituted the single most important aspect of the preparation of the dissertation. For this reason, the following paragraphs discuss its administration in some detail. These remarks are initiated with a description of the project's population and sample. A discussion of the mailing of the questionnaire as well as the number of responses follows. This section of the present chapter closes with a review of the general comments the writer received from

the ministers regarding the questionnaire in its entirety.

Population and Sample

On June 30, 1969, the date of the latest tally available to the writer,[1] approximately 2563 ordained clergymen were employed by the Seventh-day Adventist denomination in the United States of America. This total includes those ordained clergymen who were employed by the following organizations:

1. the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists,

2. the nine union conferences of Seventh-day Adventists located within the United States,

3. the four publishing associations, nine colleges, and two universities operated by Seventh-day Adventists in the United States,

4. the fifty-three local conferences of Seventh-day Adventists in the United States.

These 2563 ordained clergymen constituted the project's population. As such, the population excluded a substantial number of Seventh-day Adventist clergymen who were credentialed but not ordained, employed by organizations other than those listed, or not residents of the United States. (Table 1)

Great care must be exercised so that any conclusions inferred from the data collated in the administration of the survey are not applied to clergymen who were excluded from the population.

---

[1] The population and sample were drawn from names listed in the *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook: 1970* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1971). Because of an extended delay in production, a more recent edition of this yearbook was unfortunately not available to the writer.

The names of the clergymen constituting the population were separately randomized for each of the employing organizations by a standard technique. Twenty-one names were chosen from the General Conference, thirty-two from the nine union conferences, forty-eight from the selected publishing and educational institutions, and 391 names from the fifty-three local conferences. These 492 names constituted the project's sample. (Tables 1 & 4)

Mailing and Returns

On May 1, 1972, 492 envelopes were mailed to the clergymen constituting the probable sample. Each envelope contained a letter requesting the minister's response, a copy of the questionnaire, and a self addressed business reply envelope.

Within a week, 118 questionnaires were returned. From then on, however, the number of forms returned each week slowly diminished. Eventually, it seemed advisable to exclude any additional returned questionnaires from the analysis so that the project might proceed without further delay. By July 15, the termination date for accepting returned questionnaires, the writer had received 262 completed forms. This return, representing responses from more than ten percent of the population and fifty percent of the probable sample, exceeded the writer's expectations. (Table 2)

An analysis of the geographical distribution of the returns suggests that the percentage of responses was greater from the states bordering the Pacific Ocean and the Great Lakes than elsewhere. This over-accentuates the actual geographical distribution of the clergymen

to a slight degree. A more serious problem revolved around the fact that fifty-two of the returned business reply envelopes possessed marks of origin which were illegible. This invalidated the attempt to ascertain whether or not the ministers' attitudes were related to their geographical locations. (Table 3)

An analysis of the stratous distribution of the returns revealed definite skewing. The percentage of returned questionnaires was much greater from the ministers employed by the General Conference and the various institutions than it was from the nine union and fifty-three local conferences. In fact, the number of returns from the ministers employed by the selected institutions equaled the sample while the number of returns from ministers employed by the General Conference actually exceeded the sample. (Table 4)

Several factors may have contributed to this over-abundance of returns from the General Conference and from the institutions. It may be that these clergymen were more interested in the issue of participation in war than were the others. It may also be that these clergymen are more efficient in expediting their correspondence. It may even be true that a significant number of ministers became affiliated with the General Conference or the various institutions between June 30, 1969, and May 1, 1972.

The most significant factor, however, seems to be that the questionnaire provided no way for retired clergymen to indicate their professional positions. It became evident that several ministers who had retired since June 30, 1969 indicated that they were employed by the General Conference or by one of the various institutions. With

respect to the purposes of the survey, the attitudes of these clergymen were relevant. The skewing did invalidate, however, the attempt to discover whether or not the ministers' attitudes were related to their present professional positions.

General Comments

Many of the ministers commented upon one or more of the queries included in the questionnaire. These comments are discussed elsewhere in this dissertation. The following paragraphs describe some of the more general comments the ministers offered regarding the questionnaire in its entirety.

Many of the ministers expressed good will to the writer. Merely completing and returning the questionnaire reflects a measure of good will. Yet, many spent additional time and effort in the expressions of their affirmations. One such comment was brief and pointed: "Blessings on you and good luck!"

There were a few ministers who found the questionnaire to be quite inadequate. One wrote that he found it impossible to respond to much of the questionnaire. "In my mind," he declared, "the issues are not that black and white. This whole subject is very complex and subject to a balance of many principles which each must answer for himself."

Others were more specific in their criticisms. One minister declared that the questionnaire's definition of combatancy "is very open for debate and I disagree with it." He also declared that his answers were based "solely by my response to your definitions" rather

than upon "what I think these terms to mean."

There were those who were perplexed by the form's attempt to measure the intensity as well as the direction of the ministers' attitudes. "What is the difference between 'practical' and 'highly practical'?" asked one. Another declared that he did not "understand what difference there could be between 'moral' and 'highly moral.'"

Finally, a few comments suggested that some of the clergymen experience frustration with respect to the issue of participation in war. "What do you propose?" asked one. "Why don't you ask easy questions? This is a very difficult proposition! Who has all the answers?" declared another. Perhaps the strongest negative response came from the clergyman who indicated that the questionnaire included "foolish questions inspired by Satan to confuse the issue."

ANALYSIS AND APPRAISAL

The final step in the preparation of this dissertation included the collation, interpretation, and evaluation of the data. The following paragraphs describe the procedures which were utilized in these regards.

Item Analysis

Shortly after July 15, 1972, each of the returned questionnaires was numbered. In addition, numbers were assigned to each of the questions and to each of the possible answers. The ministers responses were then transferred to computer cards which were processed in an item analysis program at the Loma Linda University Scientific

Computation Facility.[2]

The item analysis output contained the number and percentage of ministers who indicated agreement with each of the possible answers. The output also contained the number and percentage of ministers who did not indicate agreement with any of a particular question's possible answers. Eventually, the percentages were rounded and tables were prepared which summarized the findings in visual form.

Chi-Square Analysis

In order to determine whether or not significant relationships appeared between items in the collated data, it was decided to administer a chi-square analysis as well as an item analysis. A total of 115 possible relationships were examined when the data cards were processed under a chi-square program.

The computer output included a frequency distribution table with row and column sums as well as an indication of the expected value matrix, chi-square, degrees of freedom, and level of significance of each of the 115 potential relationships.

With respect to the identification of actual relationships, three closely related criteria were utilized in the scrutiny of the computer output. First, no possible relationship was presumed actual unless it was significant at .05 or better. Second, no possible relationship was presumed actual unless it met or exceeded the minimal

---

[2]The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the administrators of Loma Linda University's Scientific Computation Facility for their generous assistance.

chi-square expectations demanded by the approved level of significance and the observed degrees of freedom.[3] Third, no possible relationship was presumed actual unless a substantial variation appeared between the frequency distribution theoretically expected if no relationship prevails and the observed frequency distribution. Cells were combined, however, when the frequencies they contained were too minimal for exact analysis and when such combinations did not distort the data summarized by the frequency tables.

When these three criteria were applied, only thirteen of the 115 possible relationships were presumed actual. This may seem overly severe and conservative. It was decided, however, to err, if at all, on the side of caution.

Two additional remarks are in order. First, on the negative side, it must be remembered that, even after cell combination, the frequencies contained by some cells were so minimal that error in judgment is possible. Second, on the positive side, chi-square analyses are only capable of testing statistical evidence for or against a possible relationship. Other kinds of evidence can and must be considered as well. To declare, therefore, that an inquiry discovered no statistical evidence that a relationship exists does not automatically and necessarily lead to the conclusion that the relationship does not actually prevail.

---

[3]In this determination, the writer consulted the statistical tables available in Ronald A. Fisher, *Statistical Methods for Research Workers* (8th ed.; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1941) and John E. Freund, *Modern Elementary Statistics* (2d. ed.; Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960).

Interpretation and Evaluation

It was decided to utilize the typology developed in H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture*[4] in the interpretation of the findings. Because an overwhelming convergency was discovered between traditional Seventh-day Adventist views regarding participation in war and the attitudes of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist clergymen in the United States, it was decided to focus the interpretation exclusively upon noncombatancy, Adventism's historic position. The interpretation says nothing, therefore, regarding the views of the few Adventist clergymen who do not understand themselves to be noncombatants.

In the final chapter, the writer delineates his perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy. It must be indicated that the writer is a Seventh-day Adventist who, until he received a ministerial classification, was registered with the Selective Service as a noncombatant (I-A-O). His remarks are therefore not without the prejudice which comes from close association and identification. Therein lies a limitation as well as an advantage.

SUMMARY AND REMAINING QUESTIONS

This dissertation's first chapter briefly reviewed the history of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy. It suggested that the characteristic features of the stance were formulated during the American

---

[4]H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1956).

Civil War. It also suggested that the practical implementation of noncombatancy was largely deferred until the first half of the twentieth century. Finally, the first chapter suggested that, despite some criticism, Seventh-day Adventist administrators have decided to retain the denomination's traditional position. It closed with a list of four questions to be answered regarding the attitudes of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist clergymen.

The present chapter described the procedures used in the research initiated in the preparation of this dissertation. It indicated that this research occurred in three steps. First, the specifying questions, working definitions, and questionnaire were formulated. Second, the survey was administered. This entailed determining the population and sample, mailing the questionnaires, assessing the returns, and analyzing the general comments. Third, the data was collated, interpreted, and evaluated. This final step included the utilization of Loma Linda University's Scientific Computation Facility, the application of a typology developed by H. Richard Niebuhr, and the delineation of the writer's perceptions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy.

Are there any significant patterns in the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist clergymen in the United States of America toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism? What are the characteristics of the ministers' theological opinions which may be relevant to this issue? What are their personal characteristics? These questions will be answered in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE FINDINGS: OPINIONS, ATTITUDES, AND ATTRIBUTES

IN ISOLATION

The questionnaire which was mailed to the Seventh-day Adventist

clergymen constituting the probable sample included queries regarding

the ministers' attitudes toward participation in war. In addition,

it included queries regarding certain of the ministers' theological

opinions and personal attributes. This chapter discusses the minis-

ters' responses to these various queries. A subsequent chapter will

describe the relationships among the ministers' responses.[1]

THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS

The questionnaire's first nine questions focused upon the

ministers' theological opinions. They inquired into the ministers'

views regarding the moral tendency of human beings, the nature of sin,

the nature of Christian perfection, the interaction between Christian-

ity and society, and the degree of the ministers' theological certainty.

Moral Inclination

The ministers seems to be somewhat pessimistic about the moral

tendency of human beings. A full 62 percent believe that humans are

---

[1]The division of this report of the research findings is
merely an organizational expedient. It should not be taken as an in-
dication that attitudes are separable from their cognitive and non-
cognitive contexts.

53

inclined toward evil. Thirty-five percent believe that humans are inclined toward both good and evil. Only 2 percent of the ministers[2] believe that humans are inclined toward good. (Table 5)

One minister wrote that the "heart is deceitful above all things" and is "born in sin" and "shapen in iniquity." His comments, which echo several Biblical passages,[3] seem to reflect the views of most of this minister's Seventh-day Adventist colleagues. There was one minister, however, who wrote that human beings are inclined toward good as well as evil "because God's spirit works in the hearts of all."

Nature of Sin

The ministers seem to be divided between those who rely upon juridical metaphors to describe sin and those who employ metaphors derived from existentialism or depth psychology as well as metaphors derived from jurisprudence in their descriptions of sin. Forty-two percent describe sin as a specific violation of moral law and 50 percent describe sin as a general state of alienation and estrangement as well as a specific violation of moral law. Only 7 percent of the ministers describe sin as estrangement and alienation rather than legal violation. (Table 6)

---

[2]Phrases such as "the ministers" are used in this dissertation as abbreviations of "the Seventh-day Adventist clergymen constituting the probable sample who completed and returned the questionnaire." Whether or not these ministers are representative of their colleagues is discussed in the second chapter.

[3]Jeremiah 17:9; Psalms 51:5.

A divergency of understanding is evident among the ministers who describe sin as alienation and estrangement as well as legal violation. One minister wrote that specific violations of moral law are "expressions" of general states of alienation and estrangement. Another minister took the opposite view, that general states of alienation and estrangement are "consequences" of specific violations of moral law.

Christian Perfection

The ministers seem to lean toward perfectionism in their opinions regarding the inclusiveness of divine grace. Eighty-eight percent believe that divine grace provides power enabling persons to overcome sin as well as forgiveness relevant to existing sin. Only 7 percent of the ministers understand divine grace as forgiveness rather than power and only 4 percent understand it as power rather than forgiveness. (Table 7)

The ministers understand Christian perfection in dynamic rather than static terms. Eighty-three percent believe that Christian perfection is a process of continuing maturity while only 13 percent believe it is a state of absolute sinlessness as well as a process of continuing maturity. Only 2 percent of the ministers believe that Christian perfection is a state of absolute sinlessness rather than a process of continuing maturity. (Table 8)

In spite of the significant degree of their solidarity regarding the inclusiveness of divine grace and the dynamism of Christian perfection, the ministers seem to be divided in their opinions

regarding the possibility of attaining absolute sinlessness in this life with divine power. Thirty-eight percent believe that this is always possible but 34 percent believe it is never possible. Similarly, 9 percent believe that it is usually possible to attain absolute sinlessness in this life by divine power but 7 percent believe that this is only occasionally possible. (Table 9)

Twelve percent of the ministers did not respond to this question. This may indicate that the ministers are divided and uncertain of themselves regarding this issue or that the question was inadequately formulated. The number and content of the written comments regarding this question suggest that a combination of these factors is the most appropriate interpretation.

One cluster of comments criticized the question's wording. "What do you mean by absolute sinlessness?" asked one minister. "Either this question is very imperfect," declared another, "or I'm not perfect enough to answer it."

A second cluster of comments emphasized the convictions of those ministers who believe that it is possible to attain absolute sinlessness in this life by divine power. "It is possible," commented one. "It is theoretically possible," declared another. Other ministers cited Biblical passages in support of their positions[4] or amplified their convictions more fully in extended comments. "Sinlessness," wrote one, "is a state of living in complete harmony with known

---

[4]Jude 24; Matthew 5:48; Philippians 4:13; Isaiah 64:6; Revelation 1:14; John 15:5.

standards of righteousness, assuming one has availed himself of each opportunity to learn God's will." "Absolute sinlessness," commented another, "is a life fully committed to Christ even though in fact the person is not as perfect as Christ. I am as perfect in my sphere as God is in His."

A third cluster of comments underscored the opinions of those ministers who believe it is not possible to attain absolute sinlessness in this life by divine power. One such clergyman quoted 1 John 1:10: "If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." Another indicated that it is never possible to attain absolute sinlessness in this life "assuming that 'absolute sinlessness' implies there is no possibility of sinning again." "God has as much as said so," commented another, "but who can cite an example?"

The ministers' perfectionism emerged once again in their opinions regarding the necessity of choosing the lesser of two evils. Forty-five percent believe that it is never necessary to choose the lesser of two evils and 35 percent believe that it is occasionally necessary to do so. Only 4 percent of the ministers believe that it is usually necessary to choose the lesser of two evils and 9 percent believe that it is always necessary. Six percent of the ministers did not answer this question. (Table 10)

"Never choose evil whether it is the lesser of two or not!" commented one minister. Another suggested that "there are no 'lesser evils' in God's sight." One minister indicated, however, that this is "not a moral issue." "We are living in a sinful world," he continued, "and therefore our choice, at times, is not between absolutes."

Another agreed with this viewpoint admitting that it is, for instance, occasionally necessary to choose the lesser of two evils "regarding two presidential candidates."

Christianity and Society

The ministers seem to be divided in their opinions regarding the legitimate scope of Christianity's moral concern. Forty-four percent of the ministers believe that the Christian moral conscience should focus exclusively upon the behavior of individual citizens. Yet, despite this heavy emphasis upon personal rather than social ethics, a somewhat larger 53 percent of the ministers believe that Christianity should concern itself with the moral behavior of corporate governments as well as the moral behavior of individual citizens. Only 1 percent of the ministers believe that Christianity should focus exclusively upon the activities of corporate governments. (Table 11)

One minister suggested that individual Christians do well when they concern themselves with the moral behavior of both individual citizens and corporate governments. He insisted, however, that Christian institutions should restrict their focus to the moral behavior of individual citizens. It may be that his views, which indicate a tendency toward ecclesiological privatism, adequately capture the opinions of many of his colleagues.

This hypothesis seems to be substantiated by the quietistic characteristics of the ministers' opinions regarding the Church's proper role in society. Only 21 percent of the ministers believe that the Church should encourage political and economic reform as well as

religious and spiritual reform. Seventy-six percent of the ministers believe that the Church should concentrate exclusively upon religious and spiritual reform. (Table 12)

The ministers' ecclesiological privatism and quietism was also revealed in their written comments. Several of those who indicated that the Church should encourage political and economic reform as well as religious and spiritual reform qualified their positions in important ways. One minister suggested that the Church should encourage political and economic reform in "very limited ways." Another suggested that the Church should engage itself in such activities "to a limited degree." Still another suggested that the Church should enter the political arena "by vote and voice only." "By my answer," declared another, "I don't mean civil disobedience or marches. As individual citizens we should vote for and advocate proper government."

Theological Certainty

The ministers seem to be fairly confident that their opinions regarding the issues probed in the questionnaire are generally valid and appropriate. Ninety-two percent of the ministers are either certain or very certain of their understandings. Six percent seem to be indifferent—neither certain nor uncertain. Less than one percent are uncertain or very uncertain regarding their positions on the issues the questionnaire investigated. (Table 13)

ETHICAL ATTITUDES

The questionnaire's second cluster of twelve questions

concentrated upon the ministers' attitudes regarding the morality of participating in war. They inquired into the ministers' attitudes toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism. In addition, they inquired into the ministers' personal positions with respect to participation in war and their personal positions regarding Seventh-day Adventist policy on participation in war. One question inquired into the ministers' certainty in these regards.

Combatancy

Presumably, there have always been those who have believed that citizens act appropriately if they participate in any aspect of any war their nation may wage against other nations. The questionnaire called this position "combatancy."

The ministers' attitudes regarding the morality of combatancy seem to be rather negative. Seventy percent consider it to be immoral or highly immoral. Nineteen percent are indifferent. These consider combatancy to be neither moral nor immoral. Only 6 percent consider it to be moral or highly moral. Five percent of the ministers did not respond to this question. (Table 14)

With respect to the practicality of combatancy, the ministers seem to be divided in their attitudes. Thirty-seven percent consider it to be practical or highly practical. Twenty percent consider it to be neither practical nor impractical. Thirty-three percent consider it to be impractical or highly impractical. Nine percent of the ministers did not answer this question. (Table 15)

Noncombatancy

For over one hundred years, Seventh-day Adventist leaders have recommended that their constituents refrain from those aspects of military life which entail the direct destruction of human beings. They have also recommended, however, that Seventh-day Adventists participate in those dimensions of military life which do not entail the direct destruction of human life. For this reason, many Seventh-day Adventist young men have participated in war in medical and paramedical capacities.[5] The questionnaire called this position "noncombatancy" in accordance with Seventh-day Adventist parlance.

The ministers' attitudes regarding the morality of noncombatancy seem to be very positive. Eighty-four percent consider it to be moral or highly moral. Eleven percent are indifferent. These consider noncombatancy to be neither moral nor immoral. Only 2 percent of the ministers consider noncombatancy to be immoral or highly immoral. Two percent of the ministers did not answer this question. (Table 16)

The ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of noncombatancy also seem to be rather positive. Sixty-six percent consider it to be practical or highly practical. Fourteen percent of the ministers consider noncombatancy to be neither practical nor impractical. Similarly, fourteen percent consider it to be impractical or highly impractical. Six percent of the ministers did not respond to this

_____

[5]The first chapter of this dissertation discusses the history of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy.

query. (Table 17)

Selective Pacifism

In recent years, there has been renewed interest among Christians regarding the possibilities of refusing to participate in those wars one considers unjust. The questionnaire called this position, which presupposes that some wars are more just than others, "selective pacifism."[6]

The ministers seem to be divided in their attitudes regarding the morality of selective pacifism. Twenty-seven percent consider it to be moral or highly moral. Thirty-nine percent of the ministers consider it to be neither moral nor immoral. Twenty-seven percent consider it to be immoral or highly immoral. Seven percent of the ministers did not answer this question. (Table 18)

The ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of selective pacifism seem to be rather negative.[7] Fifty-four percent consider it to be impractical or highly impractical. Twenty percent consider selective pacifism to be neither practical nor impractical. Seventeen percent of the ministers consider it to be practical or highly practical. Nine percent of the ministers did not answer this question. (Table 19)

---

[6]Ralph Potter, *War and Moral Discourse* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969) is one example of such interest.

[7]This may reflect the fact that as of this writing conscientious objection to particular wars is not a legal option in the United States of America.

Absolute Pacifism

There seems always to have been a Christian tradition which has maintained that participation in any aspect of war, combatant or non-combatant, is inconsistent with the implications of the gospel.[8] The questionnaire called this position "absolute pacifism."

The ministers seem to be divided in their attitudes regarding the morality of absolute pacifism. Thirty percent consider it to be moral or highly moral. Thirty-one percent consider absolute pacifism to be neither moral nor immoral. Thirty-three percent of the ministers consider it to be immoral or highly immoral. Five percent did not answer this question. (Table 20)

The ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of absolute pacifism seem to be rather negative. Sixty-two percent consider it to be impractical or highly impractical. Sixteen percent consider it to be neither practical nor impractical. Thirteen percent of the ministers consider absolute pacifism to be practical or highly practical. Nine percent of the ministers did not respond to this query. (Table 21)

Personal Positions

The ministers overwhelmingly identified themselves with Seventh-day Adventism's traditional recommendations with respect to

---

[8] The discussion of pacifism in Roland Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960) is relevant at this point.

participation in war. Eighty-seven percent of the ministers understand themselves to be noncombatants. Six percent of the ministers consider themselves to be selective pacifists. Only four percent of the ministers understand themselves to be absolute pacifists. Not even one minister indicated that he understood himself to be a combatant. Three percent of the ministers did not answer this question. (Table 22)

One minister commented, however, that the questionnaire's description of noncombatancy was unduly negative. Claiming that he understood himself to be a noncombatant, he asserted that his position is "best described as a willingness to cooperate with the activities of one's government in supporting and saving life in time of war."

Denominational Policy

The ministers seem to be divided into majority and minority viewpoints with respect to the positions on participation in war which merit approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, the denomination's highest administrative organization.[9] The majority position is clearly represented by the sixty-two percent who are convinced that noncombatancy is the only alternative deserving such approval. The minority position is visible, however, in the twenty-two percent who are convinced that more than one of the four alternatives merits approval from the General Conference. Almost without exception, these "pluralists" are convinced that the General Conference should

---

[9]*Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1967), p. 48.

look with favor upon noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism. Presumably, the three percent who believe that the General Conference should approve of all the positions discussed in the questionnaire would add combatancy to the other positions. (Table 23)

This question evoked more comments than any other single query in the questionnaire. Several of the comments indicated that the denomination should reserve its approval for noncombatancy. One minister stated that Seventh-day Adventists should not change their traditional position but "take the same stand as always." Another minister indicated that the denomination has gone on record in favor of noncombatancy and "one war, such as the Viet Nam war, should not make any difference in the stand taken by the General Conference."

Other comments developed a distinction between denominational advocacy and denominational approval. "By substituting the word 'recommend' for 'approve,'" wrote one, "I would check the noncombatancy line." "If by approve you mean accept," wrote another, "my answer would be all of these. But if by approve you mean to advocate or promote, then my answer is noncombatancy."

Most of the comments evoked by this question were written by those who advocate denominational pluralism with respect to the issue of participation in war. "I support the view of the individual conscience," wrote one minister. "It seems to me," commented another, "that this should be a personal choice and the General Conference should support the rights of individuals." "This is a personal decision," wrote still another, "which the individual should make on his own as long as he violates no law." One minister wrote that the

General Conference should "recognize the right of the conscientious

individual" and another declared that the denomination should "allow

for personal decision without prejudice."

The ministers also seem to be divided into majority and minor-

ity persuasions regarding the alternative positions with respect to

participation in war which merit legislative support from the North

American Division of Seventh-day Adventists, the denomination's highest

administrative body for affairs in the United States. Fifty-five per-

cent of the ministers believe that such support should be reserved for

noncombatancy. Twenty-three percent are convinced that the denomina-

tion's chief organization in the United States should provide legisla-

tive support for several or all four of the alternatives discussed in

the questionnaire. Nine percent believe that the North American Divi-

sion of Seventh-day Adventists should not provide legislative support

for any of the positions. Four percent think that this support should

be reserved for selective pacifism and two percent believe that it

should be limited to absolute pacifism. Six percent of the ministers

did not answer this question. (Table 24)

This question evoked a significant number of comments reflect-

ing the quietistic and privatistic orientations of many Seventh-day

Adventist clergymen. "Keep out of politics!" wrote one. "The North

American Division has or should have no concern in this," declared

another. "I don't believe that the Church should involve itself

in a matter so definitely political in nature," commented still

another.

Moral Certainty

The ministers seem to be confident that their ethical attitudes regarding the issues discussed in the questionnaire are generally valid and appropriate. Eighty-eight percent are either certain or very certain of their convictions in these regards. Six percent seem to be indifferent--neither certain nor uncertain. Only three percent of the ministers indicated that they experienced any uncertainty at all. Two percent of the ministers did not answer the question. (Table 25)

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

The questionnaire's last nine questions focused upon the ministers' personal characteristics. It inquired into their ages, denominational heritages, education and training, conscriptable offspring, military experience, and present professional positions. The purpose of these queries was not to provide data for a profile of the Seventh-day Adventist ministry in the United States but to solicit data useful in chi-square analyses of the ministers' responses to the questions regarding their theological opinions and ethical attitudes.

Age

Candidates for the Seventh-day Adventist ministry are not usually ordained until they have served successfully in ministerial capacities for several years. The questionnaire was mailed to a probable sample of the ordained Seventh-day Adventist clergymen in the United States of America. This may explain the fact that only seven

percent of the ministers are[10] between twenty-five and thirty-five years old. Twenty-one percent of the ministers are between thirty-five and forty-five years of age. Forty percent are between forty-five and fifty-five years old. Twenty-seven percent of the ministers are between fifty-five and sixty-five years of age and five percent are more than sixty-five years old. (Table 26)

Denominational Heritage

Most Seventh-day Adventist clergymen seem to be first, second, or third generation Seventh-day Adventists. Thirty-eight percent of the ministers are second generation Adventists. Thirty-percent are first generation and twenty-seven percent are third generation Seventh-day Adventists. Only four percent of the ministers have Seventh-day Adventist heritages going back for more than three generations. (Table 27)

Education and Training

Nine percent of the ministers have earned at least one academic or professional doctorate. An additional nine percent have earned a three-year seminary degree. Twenty-five percent of the ministers hold master's degrees and 49 percent hold bachelor's degrees. Six percent of the ministers have not earned college degrees of any sort. (Table 28)

---

[10]The present tense is used here and elsewhere in this dissertation as an abbreviation for "at the time of this writing."

Forty-four percent of the ministers have had no formal training from the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps. Thirty-six percent have had some such training and twelve percent have had a great deal of training from the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps. Six percent have had very little such training. (Table 29)

Conscriptable Offspring

Twenty-eight percent of the ministers have no children who have been, are, or will be eligible for military service. Thirty-five percent of the ministers have one such child and 25 percent have two such children. Eleven percent of the ministers have three or more children who have been, are, or will be eligible for military service. (Table 30)

Military Experience

Seventy-one percent of the ministers have never been required to participate in military life in any capacity. Eighteen percent have participated in military life as noncombatants and nine percent have served as combatants. Only one percent of the ministers actually refused to participate in military activities of any sort. (Table 31)

Eighteen percent of the ministers served in the Army and nine percent served in the various other branches of the armed forces. Sixty-three percent of the ministers indicated that they have not participated in any branch of the armed forces and ten percent did not answer this question. (Table 32)

Twenty-one percent of the ministers participated in World

War II and three percent participated in the Korean War. Sixty-three

percent indicated that they did not participate in any of the wars

listed in the questionnaire and twelve percent did not answer this

question. (Table 33)

Professional Positions

Sixty-five percent of the ministers are employed by local

conferences of Seventh-day Adventists in the United States. Eighteen

percent are employed by the denomination's educational, medical, and

publishing institutions in America. Seven percent of the ministers are

employed by the various union conferences of Seventh-day Adventists in

America and eight percent are employed by the General Conference of

Seventh-day Adventists.

SUMMARY AND REMAINING QUESTIONS

Are there any significant patterns in the attitudes of Seventh-

day Adventist clergymen in the United States of America toward combat-

ancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism? The

findings just reviewed suggest that this question should be answered

in the affirmative. The following conclusions seem to be warranted:

1. The ministers' attitudes tend to be positive regarding the

morality and practicality of noncombatancy.

2. The ministers' attitudes tend to be negative regarding the

morality of combatancy, the practicality of selective pacifism, and

the practicality of absolute pacifism.

3. The ministers seem to be divided in their attitudes

regarding the practicality of combatancy, the morality of selective pacifism, and the morality of absolute pacifism.

4. The ministers overwhelmingly identified themselves with noncombatancy, Seventh-day Adventism's traditional position with respect to participation in war.

5. Most of the ministers believe that the denomination should reserve its approval and legislative support for noncombatancy. A minority believes the denomination should be more pluralistic in its policies and recommendations regarding participation in war.

Are there any significant relationships between these various attitudes? Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' attitudes and their theological opinions? Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' attitudes and their personal attributes? These questions will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS: OPINIONS, ATTITUDES, AND ATTRIBUTES

IN RELATION

The questionnaire which was mailed to the Seventh-day Adventist clergymen constituting the probable sample was divided into three sections. The first section consisted of queries regarding certain of the ministers' theological opinions. The second section inquired into the ministers' attitudes toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism. The third section attempted to gather data regarding some of the ministers' personal attributes.

The previous chapter discussed the ministers' responses to these various questions without commenting upon the relationships between the ministers' answers. This chapter concentrates upon the relationships. First, it discusses the relationships among the ministers' several attitudes. Second, it discusses the relationships between the ministers' attitudes and their theological opinions. Third, it discusses the relationships between the ministers' attitudes and their personal attributes. The chapter concludes with a statement summarizing these findings.

ATTITUDES VERSUS ATTITUDES

Near the end of his analysis of the history of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy, Roger Davis suggested that to "discover the value of noncombatancy--considering the theological beliefs of

72

Seventh-day Adventists—it is necessary to review the practical results

of its applications."[1] Sometime later, in a letter to this writer, he

stated:

> Early in my research I became convinced that the theological as-
> pects of our traditional church doctrine or policy are not as his-
> torically important as the pragmatic aspects of noncombatancy. I
> now believe that the church has used noncombatancy as an expedient
> means of satisfying the conscientious convictions of most of the
> church membership as well as earning a reputation as co-operators
> in the eyes of the government.[2]

Davis' comments, together with other lines of evidence,[3] tempt

one to suppose that positive relationships exist between the ministers'

attitudes regarding the practicality of combatancy, noncombatancy,

selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism and their attitudes regarding

the morality of these options. The following paragraphs discuss the

project's findings in these regards.

Combatancy: Practicality Versus Morality

There seems to be a positive relationship between the minis-

ters' attitudes regarding the practicality of combatancy and their

attitudes regarding the morality of combatancy.

The number of ministers considering combatancy to be moral

---

[1]Roger G. Davis, "Conscientious Cooperators: The Seventh-day
Adventists and Military Service, 1860-1945" (unpublished Doctor's
dissertation, George Washington University, 1970), p. 225.

[2]Personal correspondence between Roger G. Davis and the writer,
Feb. 21, 1972.

[3]One minister indicated on his questionnaire that he is a non-
combatant because "it is the expedient position."

or highly moral as well as practical or highly practical was greater than theoretically expected[4] while the number of ministers considering combatancy to be immoral or highly immoral as well as practical or highly practical was smaller than theoretically expected.

Conversely, the number of ministers considering combatancy to be moral or highly moral as well as impractical or highly impractical nearly equaled theoretical expectations while the number of ministers considering combatancy to be immoral or highly immoral as well as impractical or highly impractical surpassed theoretical expectations.

Finally, the number of ministers considering combatancy to be neither moral nor immoral as well as neither practical nor impractical was twice as large as theoretically expected.

The statistical significance of this particular relationship is qualified, however, by the fact that the number of ministers considering combatancy to be neither moral nor immoral as well as practical also exceeded theoretical expectations by a substantial margin. (Table 35)

Noncombatancy: Practicality Versus Morality

Although the number of frequencies is small enough in some cells of the cross-tabulations tables to make precise analysis difficult, it does seem that a positive relationship exists between the ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of noncombatancy and their

---

[4]Phrases such as "theoretically expected" are used in this dissertation as abbreviations of "the frequencies to be expected if variables are *not* related."

attitudes regarding the morality of noncombatancy.

The number of ministers considering noncombatancy to be moral or highly moral as well as practical or highly practical was greater than theoretically expected while the number of ministers considering noncombatancy to be immoral or highly immoral as well as practical or highly practical was slightly smaller than theoretical expectations suggested.

Conversely, the number of ministers considering noncombatancy to be moral or highly moral as well as impractical or highly impractical was slightly smaller than theoretically expected while the number of ministers considering it to be immoral or highly immoral as well as impractical or highly impractical was slightly greater than theoretically expected.

Finally, the number of ministers considering noncombatancy to be neither moral nor immoral as well as neither practical nor impractical was greater than theoretically expected. (Table 36)

Selective Pacifism: Practicality Versus Morality

There seems to be a positive relationship between the ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of selective pacifism and their attitudes regarding the morality of this position.

The number of ministers considering selective pacifism to be moral or highly moral as well as practical or highly practical was more than twice as large as theoretically expected while the number of ministers considering selective pacifism to be immoral or highly immoral as well as practical or highly practical was smaller than

theoretically expected.

Conversely, the number of ministers considering selective pacifism to be moral or highly moral as well as impractical or highly impractical was smaller than theoretically expected while the number of ministers considering it to be immoral or highly immoral as well as impractical or highly impractical exceeded theoretically expected frequencies by a substantial margin.

Finally, the number of ministers considering selective pacifism to be neither moral nor immoral as well as neither practical nor impractical was approximately twice as large as theoretically expected. (Table 37)

Absolute Pacifism: Practicality Versus Morality

There seems to be compelling evidence suggesting that a positive relationship exists between the ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of absolute pacifism and their attitudes regarding the morality of absolute pacifism.

More than three times as many ministers consider absolute pacifism to be moral or highly moral as well as practical or highly practical than theoretical expectations suggested while the number of ministers considering absolute pacifism to be immoral or highly immoral as well as practical or highly practical was substantially less than theoretically expected.

Conversely, the number of ministers considering absolute pacifism to be moral or highly moral as well as impractical or highly impractical was substantially smaller than theoretically expected while

the number of ministers considering it to be immoral or highly immoral as well as impractical or highly impractical substantially exceeded theoretical expectations.

Finally, the number of ministers considering absolute pacifism to be neither moral nor immoral as well as neither practical nor impractical was more than twice as large as theoretically expected. (Table 38)

OPINIONS VERSUS ATTITUDES

Some Christian thinkers have emphasized the significance of alternative theological nuances for the formulation of responsible positions with respect to contemporary moral problems. This emphasis has occurred in at least two contexts.

On the one hand, there have been important constructive theologians who have explicitly denied the legitimacy of conceiving Christian ethics as an autonomous discipline independent from systematic theology. Despite their many other important differences, Karl Barth and Paul Tillich, for instance, both refused to admit the possibility of viewing Christian ethics as a form of inquiry with its own presuppositions, goals, and methodologies. Instead, they both stressed the organic relationships between systematic theology, or dogmatics, and Christian ethics. For this reason, they understood the existence of autonomous departments of Christian ethics in some contemporary Protestant seminaries to be practical expedients with

little or no normative importance.[5]

On the other hand, there have been Christian social ethicists who have appealed to alternative formulations of Christian doctrine in their advocacies and appraisals of various moral postures. In this respect, the names of John Bennett and Reinhold Niebuhr provide vivid illustrations. Bennett explicitly utilized various theological, anthropological, and ecclesiological formulations in his examination of some of the problems which occur and reoccur in the field of international relations. Somewhat earlier in this century, Niebuhr criticized a specific variety of pacifism by suggesting that it was implicitly linked with inadequate understandings of human nature. He also criticized it for its Christological naivete and for its perfectionistic interpretations of divine grace. Although it is not necessary to imply that Niebuhr denied the importance of nontheological considerations, it does seem fair to suggest that the directions and structures of his various arguments reveal that he considered doctrinal formulation in general, and theological anthropology in particular, to be especially decisive for the development of viable analyses of the prospect and perils of utilizing military power in international conflict.[6]

---

[5]Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1936-1960), I/2, pp. 782-796. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951-1963), I, 28-34.

[6]John C. Bennett, *Foreign Policy in Christian Perspective* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966). Reinhold Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940).

These considerations lead one to seek empirical assessments of possible relationships between the theological opinions endorsed by the clergymen who were surveyed in this project and the attitudes of these same clergymen toward the various possible stances with respect to participation in war. The following paragraphs report the study's findings in these regards.

Moral Inclination

This study discovered no statistically significant evidence that there is any relationship between the ministers' opinions regarding the moral inclinations of human beings and their attitudes toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism.

Nature of Sin

It has been suggested that the ministers seem to be divided between those who rely primarily upon juridical metaphors in their descriptions of sin and those who employ metaphors derived from existentialism or depth psychology as well as metaphors derived from jurisprudence in their descriptions of sin.[7] It has also been suggested that the ministers seem to be divided into majority and minority viewpoints in their attitudes regarding the alternative stances with respect to participation in war which merit approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and legislative support from the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists.[8]

---

[7]Cf. pp. 54, 55.   [8]Cf. pp. 64-66.

There seems to be some statistically significant evidence suggesting that these two items are related. This evidence implies that those who understand sin to be a specific violation of moral law are more likely to consider noncombatancy to be the only alternative deserving denominational approval and legislative support. This same evidence suggests that those who are more pluralistic in their understandings of sin tend to be more pluralistic in their attitudes regarding denominational policy on participation in war. (Tables 39 and 40)

Christian Perfection

This study discovered no statistically significant evidence that any relationships exist between the ministers' opinions regarding the inclusiveness of divine grace, the nature of Christian perfection, the possibility of attaining absolute sinlessness in this life by divine power, and the necessity of choosing the lesser of two evils and the ministers' attitudes regarding the various positions regarding participation in war.

Christianity and Society

It has been suggested that the ministers' opinions regarding the church's proper role in society are rather quietistic.[9] There seems to be some statistically significant evidence suggesting that a positive relationship exists between the ministers' quietistic

---

[9]Cf. pp. 58-59.

ecclesiology and their overwhelming identification with noncombatancy,

Adventism's traditional position on participation in war. (Table 41)

There also seems to be some statistically significant evidence sug-

gesting that the ministers who are pluralistic in their understandings

of the church's proper role in society are likely to be pluralistic in

their attitudes regarding the alternative stances with respect to par-

ticipation in war which merit approval from the General Conference of

Seventh-day Adventists. (Table 42)

ATTRIBUTES VERSUS ATTITUDES

Some researchers have discovered significant relationships

between the personal characteristics of various Seventh-day Adventists

and the attitudes of these persons toward various items and considera-

tions. In her study of the attitudes of Adventist college students

toward mission service, Betty Stirling discovered, for instance, that

"differences in age, grades, sex, and majors are related to attitudes

toward missions and to knowledge of the mission program."[10] Similarly,

in his investigation of the attitudes of Seventh-day Adventist leaders

toward social action in behalf of America's inner cities, Theadore

Chamberlain discovered that significant relationships exist between

the respondents' knowledge and attitudes and their ages, years of

denominational service, and number of children.[11] The findings of

---

[10]Betty Stirling, "Student Attitudes toward Missions,"
Spectrum, I (Spring 1969), 56.

[11]Theadore Chamberlain, "The Church and the City: A Social
Psychological Study of Attitudes Toward Inner-city Work Among

Stirling and Chamberlain cause one to wonder if any significant relationships exist between the personal characteristics of the ministers surveyed in this project and their attitudes toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism. The following paragraphs discuss the project's findings with respect to this question.

Age

There seems to be some statistically significant evidence suggesting that a positive relationship exists between the ministers' ages and their attitudes regarding the positions on participation in war which merit approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Although the differences between theoretically expected and observed frequencies is slight, two trends do appear. On the one hand, there is a tendency for support for noncombatancy to increase with the increasing ages of the ministers. On the other hand, there is a tendency for support for pluralism in denominational policies regarding participation in war to decrease with the increasing ages of the ministers. These trends, which do not hold true for those ministers who are younger than 25 years old or older than 65 years old, imply that enthusiasm for noncombatancy is somewhat greater among the older ministers while enthusiasm for pluralistic denominational policies is somewhat greater among the younger ministers. (Table 43)

Seventh-day Adventist Leaders" (unpublished Master's thesis, Loma Linda University, 1971), pp. 70-79.

Denominational Heritage

Again, although the difference between expected and observed frequencies is not large enough for dogmatic assertions, there does seem to be some statistically significant evidence suggesting that clergymen who are first generation Seventh-day Adventists are somewhat more enthusiastic about noncombatancy than those clergymen who are second generation Adventists. For one thing, clergymen who are first generation Adventists tend to consider noncombatancy to be highly moral while the clergymen who are second generation Adventists seem to be more content with the less intense suggestion that noncombatancy is moral. (Table 44) Also, those clergymen who are first generation Adventists tend to consider noncombatancy to be the only stance meriting approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists whereas those clergymen who are second generation Adventists seem more likely to favorably consider pluralistic denominational policies regarding participation in war. (Table 45)

Education and Training

Cross examination of the ministers' responses suggests that enthusiasm for noncombatancy is greater among those Adventist clergymen who hold bachelor's or master's degrees than it is among those who hold seminary degrees or academic or professional doctorates. For one thing, the number of ministers with bachelor's or master's degrees who indicated that they understand themselves to be noncombatants was slightly greater than theoretically expected whereas the number of

clergymen holding seminary degrees or doctorates who indicated that they consider themselves to be noncombatants was slightly smaller than theoretically expected. (Table 46) As additional confirmation, the number of ministers holding bachelor's or master's degrees who indicated that noncombatancy is the only stance meriting approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists was slightly greater than theoretically expected while the number of ministers holding seminary degrees or doctorates who took this position was slightly smaller than theoretically expected. The ministers with greater amounts of formal education seem to be more open toward a pluralistic denominational policy on participation in war. (Table 47)

This study isolated no statistically significant evidence of any relationships between the amounts of training the ministers received from the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps and their attitudes toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism.

Conscriptable Offspring

This study discovered no statistically significant evidence of any relationships between the number of the ministers' children who have been, are, or will be eligible for military employment and their attitudes toward the various positions regarding participation in war.

Military Experience

This study discovered no statistically significant evidence of any relationships between the classifications, organizational

contexts, and chronological distributions of the ministers' military experiences and their attitudes.

Professional Positions

This study discovered no statistically significant evidence of any relationships between the ministers' professional positions within Adventism's denominational structure and their attitudes toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism.

SUMMARY AND REMAINING QUESTIONS

Are there any significant relationships among the ministers' various attitudes toward combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism? Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' theological opinions and their attitudes? Are there any significant relationships between the ministers' personal attributes and their attitudes? The findings just discussed suggest that each of these questions should be answered affirmatively. And yet, before the conclusions are listed, three qualifying comments must be offered.

First, it must be clearly stipulated that no single opinion or attribute is clearly related to all of the attitudes. Instead, individual opinions and individual attributes are, at times, related to individual attitudes.

Second, the analysis of the various relationships between opinions and attitudes and between attributes and attitudes is made complex and difficult because of the possibility and, in some cases, probability that significant relationships exist between various

opinions, between various attributes, and between various opinions and various attributes.

Third, in some cases the differences between expected and observed frequencies is too small to permit dogmatic inferences and generalizations. Although this negative factor is mitigated to an important degree by the writer's decision to base inferences only upon those cross-tabulations with reasonably high levels of statistical significance (.05 or better), it should not be ignored.

Keeping in mind the preceding qualifying comments, the following conclusions seem to be in order:

1. Significant relationships exist between the ministers' attitudes regarding the practicality of combatancy, noncombatancy, selective pacifism, and absolute pacifism and their attitudes regarding the morality of these stances.

2. Significant relationships exist between the ministers' opinions regarding the nature of sin and their attitudes regarding the alternative positions with respect to participation in war which merit approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists as well as legislative support from the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists.

3. Significant relationships exist between the ministers' opinions regarding the church's proper role in society and their personal positions with respect to participation in war as well as their attitudes regarding the alternative positions deserving approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

4. Significant relationships exist between the ministers'

ages and their attitudes regarding the alternative positions meriting

approval from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

5. Significant relationships exist between the ministers'

Seventh-day Adventist heritages and the degree of their enthusiasm for

noncombatancy.

6. Significant relationships exist between the levels of the

ministers' academic achievements and their enthusiasm for noncombat-

ancy.

Is there any conceptual scheme which is capable of providing

an interpretive framework useful for analyses and appraisals of Seventh-

day Adventist noncombatancy? Can such an interpretive framework bring

understanding to Seventh-day Adventist noncombatants as well as illum-

ination to external observers? These questions will be discussed in

the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

TOWARD A THEOLOGICAL EXPLICATION

Because it embodies orientations which seem widely divergent,
Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy must seem inexplicable to many ob-
servers.

On the one hand, the stance seems to incorporate an explicit
rejection of war as a means of settling intranational and international
conflict. Very early in their denominational history, Adventists de-
clared that they considered the Biblical heritage to be "contrary to
the spirit and practice of war"[1] and that they were therefore "com-
pelled to decline all participation in acts of war and bloodshed."[2]
These early Adventists also indicated officially that a compilation of
essays entitled *The Sinfulness of War*[3] was a "truthful representation"[4]
of their views. In more recent times, an informed defender of the de-
nomination's traditional position declared that "Seventh-day Adventists
abhor all war."[5] Finally, the survey administered in the preparation

---

[1]Francis M. Wilcox, *Seventh-day Adventists in Time of War*
(Washington: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1936), p. 58.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 24.

[3]*Compilations of Extracts from the Publications of Seventh-day
Adventists Setting forth their Views of the Sinfulness of War* (Battle
Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing As-
sociation, 1865).

[4]Wilcox, p. 23.

[5]Donald R. McAdams, "A Defense of the Adventist Position,"
Spectrum, I (Winter 1969), 44.

of this dissertation discovered no sympathy for combatancy among con-

temporary Seventh-day Adventist clergymen in the United States of

America.

On the other hand, however, Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy

also seems to incorporate an implicit endorsement of warfare. This im-

plicit endorsement can be identified in statements ranging from the

suggestion that "warfare is unavoidable in maintaining civil government

in a world of sin"[6] to the announcement that "even heaven has its

war."[7] It can also be seen in the denomination's attempts to disasso-

ciate itself from pacifism and in the report that in 1968 students on

at least one Seventh-day Adventist campus "hoped the President would

escalate the war and resume the bombing"[8] of North Viet Nam. Finally,

Seventh-day Adventism's implicit endorsement of warfare can be seen in

the minimal support selective pacifism and absolute pacifism received

from those ministers who responded to the survey administered in the

preparation of this dissertation.

These divergent emphases suggest that the Seventh-day Adven-

tist stance is capable of sustaining more than one viable interpreta-

tion. It may be possible, for instance, to provide an interpretation

which utilizes an historical methodology. Such an interpretation might

---

[6]National Service Organization. *Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.), p. 11.

[7]Roland Hegstad, "The High Cost of Freedom," *Insight* (October 24, 1972), 14.

[8]Lavonne Neff, "Who's in Charge Here?" *Insight* (October 24, 1972), 13.

begin by arranging the most important denominational explanations of noncombatancy in chronological order in such a way that the declarations are "grouped" or "clustered" according to the moods they evince toward warfare. The interpretation might continue by arguing that the formulators of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy recognized little or no significant difference between their position and other legal forms of conscientious objection. It might also suggest that the denomination's distinction between noncombatancy and pacifism emerged in response to the external and internal pressures World War I and World War II placed upon all forms of conscientious objection.[9] In this fashion, an historical interpretation might do justice to noncombatancy's divergent emphases by relating them to difference periods of Seventh-day Adventist history.

Another interpretation of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy might employ insights derived from sociology. Enlarging upon Robert K. Merton's theoretical reflections,[10] this approach might begin by suggesting that Seventh-day Adventism embodies some of the characteristics of a "society." It might continue by analyzing the "functions" of noncombatancy within this "society." Such an interpretation might suggest, for instance, that Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy's "manifest function" is to avoid violations of moral principle allegedly

---

[9]Roger G. Davis, "Conscientious Cooperators: The Seventh-day Adventists and Military Service, 1860-1945" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Washington University, 1970), pp. 134, 135.

[10]Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (rev. ed.; Glencoe: Free Press, 1957).

entailed in warfare's destruction of human life. It might also suggest that the stance's "latent function" is to promote institutional solidarity within the denomination by formulating a stance pacifistic enough to satisfy those Adventists with moral qualms about participating in war and militaristic enough to satisfy those Adventists who believe that pacifists are not sufficiently patriotic. In this way, a sociological interpretation of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy might do justice to the position's divergent emphases by relating them to the stance's "manifest functions" and its "latent functions."

Despite the possibilities apparent in historical and sociological interpretations, the writer has opted to offer an interpretation of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy, as revealed in its history and in the results of the survey administered in the preparation of this dissertation, which is more thoroughly theological. This entails an attempt to place the question of Christian participation in warfare in a context with a larger degree of comprehensiveness. It also entails an attempt to review some of the most typical ways Christians have tended to answer this question. Finally, the interpretation entails an attempt to demonstrate that Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy embodies several of the defining characteristics of one of the five typical answers. In all of this, the writer seeks to apply the general and theoretical insights available in H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture*[11] to an issue within a particular religious

---

[11]H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1956).

tradition in the hopes that such an application will bring understanding to those who understand themselves to be Seventh-day Adventist noncombatants as well as those who do not.

THE QUESTION IN COMPREHENSIVE CONCEPTUALITY

This section of the present chapter attempts to place the question of Christian participation in warfare in a conceptual context with a larger degree of comprehensiveness. It begins by discussing the question itself and continues by reviewing H. Richard Niebuhr's understanding of the terms "Christ" and "culture." It concludes with a review of the section's argument and a preview of the next section's area of concern.

The Question

How should a Christian relate himself to warfare in general and to any specific war in particular? It seems evident that answers to this question can and do vary in extensiveness in direct ratio to the degree of the comprehensiveness of the conceptual context in which the question is discussed.

One might take a relatively narrow reading of the question's conceptual context and immediately proceed to offer an answer with little regard for related considerations. He might declare that some form of pacifism is the only viable alternative or that Christians should feel no moral qualms about participating in any aspect of any war. He might suggest that some aspect of war or that some wars are more deserving of Christian participation than others. It seems

possible to advocate any or all of these positions as long as one limits the scope of his conceptual focus to the question simply as it presents itself.

As soon as one seeks to defend or justify his position, however, he necessarily expands the scope of his conceptual focus to include related considerations. In this event, the initial question can no longer be viewed as a singular inquiry which can be disposed of with a singular reply. Instead, it is seen as an inquiry which implicitly contains at least one other question which introduces values other than non-violence. This additional question often deals with the individual's understanding of the proper relationships between the church and the state. In this fashion the first question is seen to include a second question: "How should a Christian understand the proper relationships between the church and the state?" For this reason, two of the most representative Seventh-day Adventist apologies for noncombatancy include discussions of the relationships between church and state.[12] Similarly, a recent dissertation on Adventist views regarding the relationships between the church and the state includes a chapter on noncombatancy.[13] The first question seems to implicitly contain the second.

---

[12]National Service Organization, *Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government* and *Military Service and You* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1972).

[13]Eric D. Syme, "Seventh-day Adventist Concepts on Church and State" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, American University, 1969).

Although this additional inquiry places the initial question in a conceptual context with larger comprehensiveness, the conceptuality still is not sufficiently comprehensive. The most significant problem is

> not essentially the problem of Christianity and civilization; for Christianity, whether defined as church, creed, ethics, or movement of thought, itself moves between the poles of Christ and culture. The relation of these two authorities constitutes its problem... When the problem of loyalty to church or state is raised, Christ and cultural society stand in the background as the true objects of devotion.[14]

This suggests that the second question, "How should a Christian understand the proper relationships between the church and the state?", implicitly contains a third inquiry. This third question is this: "How should a Christian relate the claims of Christ to the claims of culture?" This means that the initial inquiry regarding Christian participation in warfare actually includes additional questions which eventually focus upon the relationship between the authority of Christ and the authority of culture. What, however, are the denotations and conotations of Niebuhr's utilization of the terms "Christ" and "culture?"

The Meaning of "Christ"

The logical initiation and concluding points for Niebuhr's understanding of Christ may well be his assertion that Jesus Christ "is the Christian's authority."[15] A Christian, therefore, is one who

> counts himself as belonging to that community of men for whom Jesus Christ--his life, words, deeds, and destiny--is of supreme importance as the key to the understanding of themselves and their

---

[14]Niebuhr, p. 11.   [15]*Ibid.*, p. 14.

world, the main source of the knowledge of God and man, good and evil, the constant companion of the conscience, and the expected deliverer from evil.[16]

In Niebuhr's estimation, it is impossible adequately to define the essence of Jesus Christ because conceptual and propositional forms of communication are incapable of exhausting that "which presents itself in the form of a person."[17] Adequate description is impossible also because he who would describe Jesus Christ can never fully escape his own historical, cultural, and ecclesiological relativity.[18]

These considerations do not, however, restrict Niebuhr to total silence. Instead, he frankly confesses his own relativity and candidly discloses that his approach to Jesus Christ is moral rather than historical or metaphysical.[19] He admits that this approach is "somewhat arbitrary" and that alternative methodologies "besides the moral one must be taken if Jesus Christ is to be described adequately."[20]

Niebuhr then discusses five of the virtues which are attributed to Jesus Christ in the New Testament literature. In each case he describes the virtue, identifies a tradition of Christian interpretation which has utilized the virtue as a clue to the essence of Jesus Christ, admits that in Jesus Christ the virtue appeared in extreme, unusual, or dramatic ways, and insists that the virtues must not be isolated from each other or from Jesus Christ's devotion to and trust in God. For Niebuhr, the essential clue to the meaning of Jesus Christ

[16]*Ibid*, p. 11.   [17]*Ibid*, p. 14.

[18]*Ibid*.   [19]*Ibid*., pp. 14, 29.   [20]*Ibid*.

is neither his love, as liberalism supposed, nor his hopefulness, as the eschatologists supposed, nor his radical obedience, as existential interpretations supposed, nor his faith, as Protestant orthodoxy supposed, nor his humility, as monasticism supposed.[21] Instead, it is "in the simplicity and completeness of his direction toward God."[22] "Thus any one of the virtues of Jesus may be taken as the key to the understanding of his character and teaching; but each is intelligible in its apparent radicalism only as a relation to God."[23]

Niebuhr takes an additional step when he suggests that Jesus Christ's devotion to and trust in God "can be symbolized by no other figure of speech so well as by the one which calls him Son of God."[24] It is not surprising, therefore, that he describes Jesus Christ in a passage which seems reminiscent, but by no means identical, to the Chalcedonian formulations:

> In his moral sonship to God Jesus Christ is not a median figure, half God, half man; he is a single person wholly directed as man toward God and wholly directed in his unity with the Father toward men. He is meditorial, not median.[25]

It seems, then, that to speak of Christ from the perspective of H. Richard Niebuhr's reflections is to speak of one whose devotion to and trust in the divine is matched by his unity with the divine in such a way that this person's authority and normative significance "comes from him in his Sonship in a double way, as man living to God and God living with men."[26]

---

[21]*Ibid.*, pp. 15-27. [22]*Ibid.*, p. 16. [23]*Ibid.*, p. 27.

[24]*Ibid.* [25]*Ibid.*, p. 29. [26]*Ibid.*

The Meaning of "Culture"

When he uses the term "culture," H. Richard Niebuhr refers to

the 'artificial, secondary environment' which man superimposes on the natural. It comprises language, habits, ideas, beliefs, customs, social organization, inherited artifacts, technical processes and values.[27]

Although he disavows any attempt to define culture's essence, Niebuhr lists seven of its most important characteristics. To begin with, cultural life is always social and social life is always cultural. Anything which "is purely private...is not a part of culture."[28] Furthermore, culture represents human achievement in the sense that it evinces human purposiveness and human effort.[29] Again, "the world of culture is a world of values."[30] That which man makes and does "is designed to serve a good."[31]

Another characteristic of culture is that its values tend to be anthropocentric because human beings usually consider themselves to be "the chief value and the source of all other values."[32] Once again, culture seeks to actualize man's imaginative discernments in forms which are tangible, visible, and audible.[33] Furthermore, it seeks not only to actualize discerned value but also to conserve, maintain, and preserve value already actualized in fragmentary ways.[34] Finally, culture's values are not monistic but pluralistic, not wholly

---

[27]*Ibid.*, p. 32.   [28]*Ibid.*, p. 33.   [29]*Ibid.*

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 34.   [31]*Ibid.*   [32]*Ibid.*, p. 35.

[33]*Ibid.*, p. 36.   [34]*Ibid.*, p. 37.

complimentary but partially contradictory. Values and loci of interest are "many, partly because men are many."[35] In summary, then, in H. Richard Niebuhr's parlance, "culture" is a term so comprehensive that it is nearly synonymous with the term "civilization."[36]

Review and Preview

This section has attempted to argue that the question regarding Christian participation in warfare necessarily entails additional questions regarding the Christian's understanding of the proper relationships between the church and the state and the way a Christian should relate the claims and authority of Christ to the claims and authority of culture. In this fashion, the initial question has been placed in a conceptual context with a significant degree of comprehensiveness.

The section has also attempted to follow H. Richard Niebuhr's lead in understanding the terms "Christ" and "culture" as the most authoritative and inclusive sources of moral obligation a Christian acknowledges and experiences.

FIVE TYPICAL ANSWERS

In his survey of the history of Christian thought and experience, Niebuhr identifies five typical ways Christians have attempted to relate the authority of Christ to the authority of culture. He describes these five alternatives with the following phrases:

---

[35]*Ibid.*, p. 38.   [36]*Ibid.*, p. 32.

1. Christ against culture
2. Christ of culture
3. Christ above culture
4. Christ and culture in paradox
5. Christ the transformer of culture[37]

Although such viable ideal types are "not like the hole in a doughnut, merely nothing, or a simple creation of one's subjective imagination,"[38] they are partially artificial constructs which must be utilized with extreme caution. They are useful in so far as they help one to recognize patterns, tendencies, and relationships in that which would otherwise appear to be a mass of chaotic and therefore meaning-less data. They are dangerous, however, to the extent that they obscure unique occurrences, multilateral interactions, and unforeseen possibilities.

These cautionary remarks are immediately relevant, for this section of the present chapter reviews H. Richard Niebuhr's identification of the five typical ways Christians have attempted to relate the claims of Christ to the claims of culture. It must be emphasized that Niebuhr's typological method is not intended to imply that any Christian individual or collective has completely, continuously, and consistently personified any one of the five alternatives. Instead, it seeks to call to attention "the continuity and significance of the great motifs that appear and reappear in the long wrestling of

---

[37]*Ibid.*, pp. vii, viii.

[38]John B. Orr and F. Patrick Nichelson, *The Radical Suburb* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), p. xviii.

Christians with their enduring problem."[39]

Antithesism

Perhaps the most dramatic and vivid attempts to discern and actualize the proper relationships between the claims of Christ and the claims of culture have been offered by those who have understood these loci of moral authority to be antithetically related. Niebuhr calls this stance the "Christ against culture" position. Although this orientation is not consistently present in these writings, Niebuhr considers the works of Tertullian and Tolstoy to be illustrative of the position.[40]

One characteristic of this stance is that its adherents often consider Jesus Christ to be the sole locus of moral authority. No other person or collective is permitted to legitimize the normative significance of his ethical imperatives. Jesus Christ is viewed as "lord."

Jesus Christ is also viewed as "king" in the sense that he is understood to have initiated and established a new community, the Christian church. This community is understood to be distinct from and superior to all other communal patterns.

Jesus Christ is also seen as the "supreme legislator." For this reason, the position emphasizes the role of obedience in Christian

---

[39]Niebuhr, p. 44.

[40]This description of antithesism is based upon Niebuhr, pp. 45-82.

moral experience. The ethical discourses attributed to Jesus of Nazareth are therefore interpreted literally and applied rigidly.

In the love that he directed toward those who associated with him, Jesus Christ is seen as the "paradigm" of the moral life. Adherents of the "Christ against culture" position are therefore advised to make special effort to direct love and concern to those within the Christian community and, secondarily, to those beyond the bonds of Christian fellowship.

Finally, Jesus Christ is viewed as the sufficient "source of value." The corollary of this perception is the explicit rejection of those alleged manifestations of cultural value which do not derive from Jesus of Nazareth. A line of demarcation is established which clearly distinguishes the new community from human civilization so that the art, philosophy, science, economic arrangement, military life, and governmental pattern of a culture are considered to be unsatisfactory.

Implicit within antithesism are several theological tendencies. Foremost among these is the tendency to differentiate revelation and reason and to maximize the former and minimize the latter. Antithesism also includes the tendency to identify sin with culture and civilization. Thirdly, the stance's emphasis upon obedience entails a tendency to closely identify law and grace. Finally, antithesism recurringly evinces the tendency to slight the doctrine of the trinity in favor of an ethical dualism which, at times, nearly elides into an ontological dualism as well.

Synthesism

If one developed a continuum illustrating the five typical ways Christians have attempted to relate the claims of Christ to the claims of culture, antithesism would presumably appear on the extreme right. On the opposite end of the continuum, the extreme left, synthesism would appear. Persons of this position, which Niebuhr called the "Christ of culture" stance, perceive a synthetical rather than an antithetical relationship between the two loci of moral authority. Niebuhr suggests that some of the Christian gnostics as well as more recent Christian thinkers such as Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Ritschl can be clustered in this grouping.[41]

At least three characteristics of synthesism[42] deserve explicit identification. First, synthesism tends to interpret culture through Christ. It isolates the aspects of culture which seem to be central, admirable, and essential. It then identifies these positive aspects of culture with the spirit of Christ. Secondly, however, synthesism interprets Christ through culture. It isolates the aspects of the available descriptions of Jesus of Nazareth which seem to be of abiding

---

[41]This description of synthesism is based upon Niebuhr, pp. 83-115.

[42]The writer has consciously and deliberately departed from Niebuhr's terminology at certain points. In particular, the writer prefers to use "synthesism" where Niebuhr uses "cultural Christians." Similarly, the writer prefers to use "hierarchism" where Niebuhr uses "synthesism". This modification in parlance is offered in the hopes that it will clarify without altering the content of Niebuhr's reflections.

significance. It then identifies these positive aspects of the various pictures of Christ with the spirit of culture. Thirdly, the result of these approaches is a motif which emphasizes continuity rather than discontinuity between the essential features of culture and the essential characteristics of Jesus Christ.

Despite their widely divergent tendencies, significant structural analogies seem to exist between the theological tendencies of synthesism and the theological tendencies of antithesism.[43] There are differences in emphasis, however, which are extremely important. For instance, both positions tend to differentiate reason and revelation. The synthesists maximize reason while the antithesists maximize revelation. Similarly, both positions refrain from considering sin to be pervasive in all aspects of human experience. Synthesists tend to associate sin with the natural world and antithesists tend to associate sin with the cultural world. Also, both positions tend to place greater emphasis upon law than upon grace. Finally, both synthesism and antithesism experience difficulty with trinitarian formulations of the doctrine of God. Antithesists have difficulty relating the notion of Christ as "lord" to the power efficient in the natural world and synthesists have difficulty relating the alleged immanent spirit of Christ to the power immanent in nature.

---

[43]This reminds the writer of Harvey Seifert's verbal suggestion that it is often useful to draw continuums as semicircles rather than as straight lines in order to illustrate the frequent convergency of positions on the continuum's extremities.

Hierarchism

Between the poles of antithesism and synthesism, three median positions appear. One of these median positions is hierarchism.[44] This motif, which Niebuhr describes as "Christ above culture," evinces at least four important features.[45] First, unlike antithesism, hierarchism refrains from dividing the moral claims of culture from the moral claims of Christ in such a way that the authority of the former is either questioned or eliminated. Instead, the hierarchist's understanding of the unity between Jesus Christ and the Creator, Sustainer, and Governor of the world causes him to affirm the legitimacy and importance of those ethical imperatives which emerge from cultural life in general.

Secondly, however, unlike synthesism, hierarchism does not identify the essential aspect of any cultural manifestation unambiguously with Jesus Christ. Instead, the hierarchist recognizes the presence of discontinuity as well as continuity between Christ and culture.

Thirdly, and most importantly, adherents of this motif relate the moral claims of culture to the moral claims of Christ in hierarchical fashion. This permits hierarchists to recognize the value of moral claims which emerge from cultural life even as they insist that

---

[44]As has been indicated, the writer uses the term "hierarchism" where Niebuhr uses the term "synthesism."

[45]This description of hierarchism is based upon Niebuhr, pp. 116-148.

there are additional moral claims which come from beyond or above

civilized existence. These additional requirements are attainable, if

at all, only by the power operative in divine grace.

Fourth, although there is a sense in which the moral claims

which come to man from beyond or above cultural life are superior to

those which emerge within cultural life, there is a fundamental unity

which is understood to pervade and encompass both loci of authority.

This unity maintains substantial roles for the ethics of society as

well as the ethics of the gospel.

Niebuhr suggests that the reflections of Clement of Alexandria

and Thomas Aquinas are illustrative of the hierarchical motif. In

Clement, the ethics of Stoicism provide the necessary and valuable

guidelines for moral development which are complimented by the more

vigorous demands of Jesus Christ. Similarly, in Thomas, Aristotelian

understandings make important contributions to ethical life which are

complimented by additional requirements which derive from the New

Testament. In these ways, both Stoicism and the New Testament, both

Aristotle and Jesus Christ, make valuable contributions to moral ex-

perience.

<u>Dualism</u>

A second median position is that which Niebuhr describes with

the phrase "Christ and culture in paradox." Persons of this persuasion

seek to relate the claims of Christ to the claims of culture

dualistically[46] rather than antithetically, synthetically, or hierarchically.[47] Niebuhr suggests that Paul of Tarsus, Martin Luther, Søren Kierkegaard, and Roger Williams may be clustered in this grouping.

At least five characteristics of the dualistic motif deserve consideration. First, unlike the antithesists, the dualists recognize the importance and normative significance of moral claims which emerge from cultural life in general.

Second, unlike the synthesists and like the hierarchists, the dualists also recognize a fundamental discontinuity between the claims of Christ and the claims of culture. This destroys the possibility of identifying the essential aspects of culture with the spirit of Christ.

Third, unlike the hierarchists, the dualists perceive the totality of human experience to be radically and universally distorted by sin so that in its entirety human experience stands in need of divine forgiveness and reconciliation. This precludes the possibility of hierarchically arranging the claims of Christ and the claims of culture so that the former compliments the latter.

Fourth, although Christ and culture are not seen as complimentary to each other, they are not so contradictory that one must necessarily and completely reject one in favor of the other. Instead, the dualist attempts to maintain these two loci of authority in tension

---

[46]In this context, the term "dualism" refers to a loyalty to two loci of moral authority rather than to a metaphysical understanding of reality.

[47]This description of dualism is based upon Niebuhr, pp. 149-189.

with each other. Adjectives such as "paradoxical," "juxtapositional," and "dialectical" are therefore deemed appropriate.

Fifth, although the claims of Christ and the claims of culture are distinguished, they are not, except in distortions of the dualistic tendency, completely divided. A unity prevails.

The dualist draws his theological conclusions from the reconciling activity of Jesus Christ. With regard to revelation and reason, he refuses to denigrate reason as the antithesists do. And yet, he testifies that human reason, no less than other dimensions of human experience, stands in need of divine forgiveness and reconciliation. The dualist is more thoroughgoing than the antithesist, synthesist, and hierarchist in his insistence that every aspect of human life is distorted by sin. With regard to the polarity between law and grace, the dualist often stands with the antithesist in asserting the continuing authority of the law of Christ. He adds, however, an additional element to the interpretation of law in his understanding of it as an instrument which drives men to despair in preparation for trust in God. Finally, the dualist's emphasis upon the duality of divine grace and divine wrath occasionally leads him into a practical binitarianism even as he espouses classical trinitarian formulations.

Two practical characteristics of the dualistic motif deserve attention. First, the consequences of the dualist's emphasis upon the universality of sin has led, on occasion, to an antinomian indifference toward the laws of society. Second, the dualist's tendency to view the institutions of society as preventers of anarchism rather than as facilitators of advancement of human life has, at times, led to a

social conservatism.

Transformism

A third median position is that stance which Niebuhr describes with the phrase "Christ the transformer of culture." This motif has been elucidated in the Gospel of John, in the writings of Augustine, and, more recently, in the theological reflections of F. D. Maurice.[48]

Transformism evinces at least three important characteristics. First, it shares many of the suppositions of the dualistic approach. This precludes the possibilities of rejecting culture in the name of Christ, identifying some aspect of culture with the spirit of Christ, and considering the claims of Christ to be complimentary to the claims of culture.

Secondly, however, transformism diverges from dualism in several respects. First, in its Christology, transformism places greater emphasis upon the participation of the Word in God's creative activity than does dualism. It also places greater emphasis upon the incarnation than does dualism which tends to stress the atonement. These emphases upon creation and incarnation resist dualism's temptation to equate finitude with sin. Transformism also emphasizes that sin is the distortion of that which is essentially good. Finally, in its interpretation of history, transformism focuses upon the dramatic interactions between God and men. This focus leads to an eschatological

---

[48]This description of transformism is based upon Niebuhr, pp. 190-229.

expectation which is realized here and now as a superior mode of human existence.

Thirdly, transformism's departure from dualism inbues it with an attitude toward culture which is more positive and hopeful than dualism's viewpoint. Culture is not merely to be juxtaposed to the moral claims of Christ. Instead, the transformist can speak of the possibility of culture's conversion, at least in partial ways. This possibility remains a genuine possibility to the transformist because it derives from the power and presence of God rather than the frailty of human beings.

DUALISM AND NONCOMBATANCY

This section of the present chapter represents an attempt to demonstrate that noncombatancy exhibits greater affinities with dualism than with any of the other four motifs. It begins by offering some words of caution regarding the scope of the argument. It then discusses noncombatancy's understanding of the authority of Christ and culture. The section closes with a description of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy as an institutionalization of a paradox.

Cautionary Remarks

The term "dualism," as it is used in these pages, refers to an allegiance to two loci of moral authority rather than to a metaphysical doctrine. Niebuhr delcared that

> This is the group which, for want of a better name, we have
> called dualist, though it is by dualistic in the sense that it

divides the world in Manichaean fashion into realms of light and darkness, of kingdoms of God and Satan.[49]

The interpretation presently offered is not intended to place a value judgment, either positive or negative, upon noncombatancy. This dissertation's final chapter will delineate the writer's opinions regarding the position's strengths and weaknesses.

It seems important to emphasize that the interpretation here offered is limited in its scope. It does not pretend that it is the only viable interpretation. Neither does it intend to imply that all Seventh-day Adventist moral reflection is dualistic. Finally, the interpretation does not deny that some aspects of noncombatancy seem alien to the dualistic tendency. The interpretation merely seeks to demonstrate that Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy exhibits greater affinities with the dualistic motif than any of the other four alternatives.

The Authority of Christ

In 1917, the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists formulated the following declaration:

> We petition that our religious convictions be recognized by those in authority, and that we be required to serve our country only in such capacity as will not violate our conscientious obedience to the law of God as contained in the decalogue, interpreted in the teachings of Christ, and exemplified in His life.[50]

This declaration is important because its last phrases reveal noncombatancy's understanding of Christ's moral authority.

---

[49]Niebuhr, p. 149.   [50]Wilcox, p. 113.

Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy considers Christ to be authoritative as an exemplifier. The character and moral style of Jesus of Nazareth are understood to be worthy of emulation. In fact, according to this view, a Christian is constrained to order his personal conduct so that it exists in all possible harmony with the pattern established by Christ.

The stance also considers Christ to be authoritative as an educator. The words, as well as the deeds, attributed to Jesus of Nazareth by the New Testament are perceived to possess normative significance. According to Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy, a Christian is compelled to arrange his affairs so that they exist in all possible harmony with the teachings of Christ.

Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy posits a fundamental unity between the deeds and words attributed to Jesus of Nazareth by the New Testament and the decalogue recorded in Exodus 20. This unity is considered to be so pervasive that Christ's actions are understood to be exemplifications rather than contradictions of the decalogue and his words are affirmed as interpretations of the decalogue of Exodus 20 rather than as innovations.

The emphases placed upon these understandings differentiate noncombatancy from any form of synthesism. Synthesists, to be sure, do not ignore or deny the moral authority of Christ's deeds and words. Yet, their procedure of identifying particular dimensions of cultural life with specific aspects of the extant descriptions of Jesus of Nazareth tends to minimize any possible opposition between the two loci of authority so that

> They feel no great tension between church and world, the social laws and the Gospel, the workings of divine grace and human effort, the ethics of salvation and the ethics of social conservation or progress.[51]

The synthetic methodology of interpreting culture through Christ and Christ through culture is foreign to the thought and experience of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy.

The emphases it places upon Christ's moral authority also differentiate the stance from any form of hierarchism. Hierarchists, like synthesists, do not spurn the claims of Christ. Yet, their tendency to relate the ethics of the gospel to a spiritual or ethical elite rather than to all members of society is also foreign to noncombatancy. In this respect, the stance is more closely related to antithesism and dualism than it is to hierarchism for

> The dualist joins the radical Christian in maintaining the authority of the law of Christ over all men, and in stating it in its plain literal sense, objecting to the attenuations of the gospel precepts by cultural [synthetic] or synthetic [hierarchic] Christians. The law of Christ is not, in his understanding, an addition to the law of man's nature but its true statement, a code for the average, normal man, and not a special rule for spiritual supermen. Yet he also insists that no human self-culture, in obedience to that law or any other, can avail to extricate man out of his sinful dilemma.[52]

Its understanding of Christ's moral authority motivates Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy's objection to the destruction of human life so prevalent in warfare for, try as it may, it can never fully convince itself that such activity is in harmony with the deeds and words of Jesus of Nazareth. This elucidates the fact that, although they are divided in their attitudes regarding combatancy's

---

[51]Niebuhr, p. 83.   [52]*Ibid.*, p. 157.

practicality, the ministers surveyed in the preparation of this disser-

tation are rather negative in their attitudes regarding combatancy's

morality.[53]

In summary, four assertions have been made. First, Seventh-

day Adventist noncombatancy considers the deeds and words attributed

to Jesus of Nazareth by the New Testament to possess normative signi-

ficance for the contemporary scene. Second, the stance posits a funda-

mental unity between Christ's actions and teachings and the decalogue

recorded in Exodus 20. Third, the emphases it places upon Christ's

moral authority differentiate noncombatancy from both synthesism and

hierarchism. Fourth, its understanding of Christ's moral authority

motivates the position's objection to personal participation in war-

fare's destruction of human life.

The Authority of Culture

Noncombatancy's convictions regarding culture's authority are

illustrated in its understanding of the authority of one aspect of

culture, the state. The position entails a conviction that the state

is divinely ordained for, as one representative document suggests,

"there are two divinely established institutions, the church and civil

governments."[54] For this reason, the Christian is constrained to

---

[53]Cf. p. 60.

[54]"The Relationships of Seventh-day Adventists to Civil Govern-
ments and War" (Declaration of the General Conference of Seventh-day
Adventists at San Francisco, June 5, 1954), cited by Davis, p. 236.

cooperate with the state unless such cooperation specifically entails

violations of conscience. James White declared in his editorial on

participation in war that "those who despise civil law, should at once

pack up and be off for some spot on God's foot-stool where there is no

civil law."[55]

A perusal of Seventh-day Adventist literature regarding non-

combatancy reveals, however, that the position envisions the state in

negative terms. Noncombatancy seems to consider the state's primary

function to be the prevention of chaos and anarchy rather than the pro-

gressive improvement of the quality of communal life. The following

passages, taken from a variety of historical epochs, illustrate this

tendency:

> Resolved, That we recognize civil government is ordained of God,
> that order, justice, and quiet may be maintained in the land; and
> that the people of God may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all
> godliness and honesty.[56]

"There is a sphere in which Caesar may rightly operate. In the field

of civil relations he may range freely. He should be a terror to evil

works..."[57]

> God saw the necessity of nations and their governments and ordained
> their existence. These governments maintain orderliness in the
> everyday relationships between individuals. They prevent the chaos

---

[55] James White, "The Nation," *Review and Herald* (August 12,
1862), 84.

[56] Wilcox, p. 24.

[57] National Service Organization, *Seventh-day Adventists and
Civil Government*, p. 5.

of the strongest taking from the weakest.[58]

As you sit in this class you are enjoying one of the privileges of citizenship in a great country--the privilege of a Christian education enjoyed freely. When you go home you will not go through the night in uncertainty and terror of armed bandits roaming the countryside. The peace and tranquility, the safety and stability that you enjoy in your daily life come from the civil government to which you owe allegiance.[59]

Its understanding of the authority of culture as illustrated in its convictions regarding one aspect of culture, the state, differentiates noncombatancy from antithesism. Antithesism tends to view the state, as well as most other cultural manifestations which are not explicitly Christian, with disdain. Noncombatancy maintains, however, that, though it does not stem directly from the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, the state is as important as the church. It is, in fact, a divinely ordained institution established for the protection of human life.

This motivates noncombatancy's objection to conscientious objection to participation in all aspects of military life. Because the state, like culture in general, possesses moral authority, and because the primary function of the state is to thwart anarchy and chaos, Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy feels constrained to encourage persons to participate in military life as fully as one's conscientious

---

[58]National Service Organization, *Military Service and You*, p. 3.

[59]Clark Smith, "Character Guidance Studies for Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps" (Washington: National Service Organization of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.), p. 1.

convictions will possibly permit. This elucidates the fact that non-combatancy has frequently attempted to clearly and dramatically differentiate itself from absolute pacifism.[60] This also explains the fact that the ministers surveyed in the preparation of this dissertation were divided in their attitudes regarding the morality of absolute pacifism.[61] Presumably, many of these clergymen believe that one who conscientiously objects to participation in all aspects of military life fails to cooperate as fully with the state as his ethical convictions will permit. Such failure constitutes, according to noncombatancy, a refusal seriously to consider culture's moral authority.

If, as suggested, noncombatancy views culture more positively than does antithesism, it views culture more negatively than does transformism. Unlike transformism, noncombatancy does not envision the possibility of culture's conversion. Instead, it is far more likely to agree with the dualist that "reason in human affairs is never separable from its egoistic, godless, perversion."[62]

> Hence the dualist joins the radical Christian in pronouncing the whole world of human culture to be godless and sick unto death. But there is this difference between them: the dualist knows that he belongs to that culture and cannot get out of it, that God indeed sustains him in it and by it; for if God in his grace did not sustain the world in its sin it would not exist for a moment.[63]

This elucidates the fact that the ministers surveyed in the preparation of this dissertation were rather pessimistic regarding the moral inclination of human beings.[64] Sometimes this pessimism is

---

[60]Cf. p. 24. [61]Cf. p. 63. [62]Neibuhr, p. 156.

[63]*Ibid.* [64]Cf. pp. 53, 54.

related to an eschatology which is more futuristic than realized or proleptic as in James White's prediction that slavery would exist in the United States until the actualization of the *parousia*.[65] More importantly, however, it is related to a searching assessment of human conduct as in Ellen White's appraisal of the Union's motivations for participating in the American Civil War. Her sympathy with the Union in its antagonism toward slavery did not blind Ellen White to the Union's alleged perversity.[66]

In summary, four assertions have been made. First, Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy maintains that culture in general and the state in particular possesses moral authority. Second, the stance understands the state's primary function to consist of the prevention of chaos and anarchy. Third, its emphases upon culture's moral authority differentiate noncombatancy from both antithesism and transformism. Fourth, its understanding of culture's authority motivates noncombatancy's more militaristic sympathies.

The Institutionalization of a Paradox

If its understanding of Christ's moral authority differentiates it from both synthesism and hierarchism, and if its understanding of culture's moral authority differentiates it from both antithesism and transformism, the warranted inference would seem to be that Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy constitutes a manifestation of the dualistic motif. That this is generally correct, and that the

---

[65]Cf. pp. 4, 5.   [66]Cf. pp. 7-11.

position can be understood as the institutionalization of a perceived

paradox, may be surmised from the following additional evidence.

First, unlike hierarchism which envisions the moral life in

irenic terms, and unlike antithesism which sees it as a struggle be-

tween the Christian community and pagan society, and unlike synthesism

which pictures it as a conflict between spirit and nature, dualism per-

ceives the moral life as a conflict between the "righteousness of God

and the righteousness of self."[67] Antecedent to all his moral reflect-

ions, therefore, is the dualist's affirmation of divine grace as recon-

ciliation.

> The miracle with which the dualist begins is the miracle of God's
> grace, which forgives these men without any merit on their part,
> receives them as children of the Father, gives them repentence,
> hope, and assurance of salvation from the dark powers that rule
> in their lives, especially death, and makes them companions of the
> one they willed to kill.[68]

That noncombatancy exhibits this emphasis upon reconciliation may be

seen in the following passages:

> Man is a citizen of his earthly country and as such has responsi-
> bilities and loyalties to it. The man who has experienced the new
> birth is also a citizen of the heavenly kingdom of God, and has
> responsibilities and loyalties to it. In the case of any conflict
> between his two responsibilities or loyalties, the heavenly citi-
> zenship is higher in importance than his earthly citizenship.[69]

> You are the citizen of a nation either by birth or by legal trans-
> action. You are the citizen of the kingdom of heaven (and a mem-
> ber of your church) by rebirth. Both of these relationships are
> important. Both of these citizenships are good for you as a
> Christian.[70]

Second, Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy, like dualism,

---

[67]Niebuhr, p. 150.   [68]*Ibid.*, p. 151.   [69]Smith, p. 11.

[70]National Service Organization, *Military Service and You*, p. 3.

exhibits political and economic conservatism as well as an emphasis upon reconciliation. It insists that a noncombatant "proves by a life of soberness and quietness that he is not an agitator or a revolution-ist."[71] This tendency seems to be related to the position's understanding of the role of the state in human affairs.

> Conservatism is a logical consequence of the tendency to think of law, state, and other institutions as restraining forces, dykes against sin, preventers of anarchy, rather than as positive agencies through which men in social union render positive service to neighbors advancing toward true life.[72]

Third, the stance, like dualism, exhibits juxtapositionalism. It embodies and embraces a paradox, a dilemma. On the one hand, its understanding of Christ's moral authority forbids it from condoning personal participation in warfare's destruction of human life. On the other hand, however, its convictions regarding culture's moral authority do not permit it to vigorously promote total conscientious objection to participation in all aspects of military life. An inner tension, an internal interaction between two divergent tendencies, is the result. Unable to resolve this internal polarity in either the direction of absolute pacifism or complete militarism, the position encircles both tendencies in an attempt to institutionalize the paradox it perceives.

> Therefore between these two great principles we think we come the nearest to solving the dilemma by taking the stand of noncombatancy. We neither take up arms at the command of the country nor are we pacifists (in the generally accepted understanding of that

---

[71]National Service Organization, *Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government*, p. 4.

[72]Niebuhr, p. 188.

term). We are noncombatants.[73]

The position clearly does not pretend to resolve its internal tensions. Instead, it suggests that its formulation comes closer to solving the problem than any other alternative. The polarity, the juxtapositionalism, the paradox, and the divergent tendencies remain.

Fourth, noncombatancy, like dualism, seems to be related to a particular experience and description of reality. Presumably, many noncombatants would affirm the suggestion that "whether or not the dualistic accounts are intelligible from the viewpoint of their inner consistency, they are intelligible and persuasive as corresponding to experience."[74]

In summary, four assertions have been made. First, like dualism, Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy exhibits an emphasis upon divine reconciliation. Second, the position, like dualism, exhibits political and economic conservatism. Third, like dualism, the position embraces, embodies, and encircles an internal polarity. Fourth, like dualism, the position bases this polarity upon an experience of reality rather than upon a necessity for rational consistency. These considerations suggest that the stance may be understood as an institutionalization of the paradox it perceives between the moral authority of Christ and the moral authority of culture.

SUMMARY AND REMAINING QUESTIONS

Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy exhibits both pacifistic

---

[73]Smith, p. 12.   [74]Niebuhr, p. 185.

and militaristic features. An historical interpretation might relate these divergent tendencies to alternative moments in time. A socio-logical interpretation might relate them to the position's manifest and latent functions. It is also possible to interpret theologically the stance as a manifestation of the dualistic attempt to relate the moral authority of Christ to the moral authority of culture. As such, it constitutes the institutionalization of a perceived paradox.

What, however, are the position's strengths? What are its weaknesses? How can its strengths be maximized? How can its weaknesses be minimized? The following chapter will delineate the writer's own answers to these questions.

CHAPTER VI

AN INTERNAL APPRAISAL AND MODEST PROPOSAL

What are the strengths of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy? What are its weaknesses? How can its strengths be maximized? How can its weaknesses be minimized? The writer delineates his answers to these questions in the present chapter.

It should be emphasized at the outset that the writer is not a neutral spectator who observes and examines the position without prejudice or bias. He is a participant, a Seventh-day Adventist who was registered as a noncombatant until he received a ministerial classification. The recommendation he offers is therefore neither radical nor revolutionary. It merely seeks to encourage noncombatancy to emphasize its most significant features. For these reasons, the following paragraphs embody an internal appraisal and modest proposal.

The first section of the chapter concentrates upon the writer's convictions regarding noncombatancy's strengths. In the second section, the writer lists his opinions regarding the position's weaknesses. The third section of the chapter constitutes a suggestion as to how noncombatancy might be improved. These three sections are followed by a summary and a consideration of questions not yet answered.

POSITIVE ASPECTS OF NONCOMBATANCY

This section of the present chapter discusses the writer's convictions regarding the positive aspects of Seventh-day Adventist

122

noncombatancy. It concentrates upon the position's consistency, its functionality, and that which, for want of a more appropriate term, may be called its generosity. Although these are not noncombatancy's only strengths, they are, in the writer's opinion, of particular importance.

Consistency

During the earliest years of the twentieth century, a mood which questioned war prevailed in most of America's Christian denominations. When World War I began, many of these denominations became nearly as militaristic as they were previously pacifistic for in many Christian circles the war assumed the trappings of a holy crusade. As isolationism swept over American politics following World War I, a pacifistic mood again became the dominant one in the American churches. This was of short duration for, after the bombing of Pearl Harbor and America's entrance in World War II, a more militant mood infiltrated American Christianity . Thus, chronological vacillation between pacifism and militarism is one of the features of American Christianity.[1]

Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy has not fully escaped this pendulum swinging. Between World War I and World War II, for instance, there is evidence which "seems to indicate that the popularity of pacifism throughout the country was having a considerable impact on

---

[1]Roger G. Davis, "Conscientious Cooperators: The Seventh-day Adventists and Military Service, 1860-1945" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Washington University, 1970), pp. 162-165.

the Seventh-day Adventist church."[2]

For more than one hundred years, however, noncombatancy has consistently recommended that (1) Seventh-day Adventists refrain from enlisting but (2) agree to participate in those aspects of military life which do not entail personal and direct participation in the destruction of human life. It has also consistently affirmed the (1) legitimacy of civil government and (2) the illegitimacy of Christian participation in the personal and direct destruction of human life.

The consistency of noncombatancy's recommendations has permitted the stance to avoid turbulent vacillations between widely divergent emphases. This has made it possible for the stance to maintain its own integrity and salient features with a minimum of accommodation to the changing demands of popular opinion.

Without a doubt, many thoughtful Christians have advocated pacifistic policies in one historical context and militaristic policies in another historical context on the basis of serious moral and theological reflection. Although the writer has no quarrel with such persons, he is convinced that some (not all!) of the vacillations in American Christianity with respect to participation in war constitute a dangerous tendency for the Christian community to espouse fashionable viewpoints without critical analysis.

Functionality

Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy has facilitated solidarity

---

[2]Davis, p. 172.

within the denomination in the United States. Its pacifistic features

have generally satisfied most of those within the denomination who

vigorously assert that to participate in warfare's destruction of human

life is to blaspheme the gospel. At the same time, however, its mili-

taristic features have generally satisfied most of the American Adven-

tists who believe that absolute pacifists are not sufficiently patri-

otic. In this respect, the stance has been quite functional.

Noncombatancy has also been quite functional because it has

facilitated international denominational solidarity as well. Remarks

such as these have done much to prevent the denomination from being

fractured into a collection of nationalistic entities:

> Think for a moment what it would mean if we accepted the principle
> that we should obey our government even to the extent of bearing
> arms. Then we would have Adventists being drafted in Country A
> and trained in the use of arms. In Country B we would have Adven-
> tists drafted and trained in the use of arms. If the Countries A
> and B were to wage war, we would have a resulting situation of
> Adventists shooting and killing Adventists on the battlefield
> because the government commanded them to do so. This could hardly
> come under the heading of obedience to God. How much better it is
> for Adventists to meet on the battlefield with the same task in
> mind--the saving of life and the alleviation of suffering.[3]

In terms of the total number of its adherents, Seventh-day

Adventism is small. In terms of the geographical distribution of its

members, it is global. In terms of its corporate style, it is institu-

tional. In short, Seventh-day Adventism is a denomination with a small

number of members who operate educational, publishing, medical, and

---

[3]Clark Smith, "Character Guidance Studies for the Seventh-day
Adventist Medical Cadet Corps" (Washington: National Service Organiza-
tion of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.),
pp. 13, 14.

evangelistic facilities all over the world. In times of war, it could

therefore be splintered into a multiplicity of nationalistic units too

weak to staff and finance their own institutions. Noncombatancy has

done much to prevent this possibility from becoming a reality.

Generosity

Noncombatancy has made it possible for young Seventh-day Adven-

tists to render humanitarian service to wounded soldiers from many

nations. Braving the terrors of battle completely unarmed, they have

sought, found, and ministered to the immediate needs of the bleeding

and dying.

Because many noncombatants have acted generously on the battle-

field, it is probably unfair to mention only one. Yet, the conduct of

Desmond T. Doss, a World War II noncombatant, deserves particular

mention:

> On 21 May [1945] Doss and his unit received orders to take an
> enemy position at the top of a cliff, and while they experienced
> no difficulty in reaching the summit, they were hit with heavy fire
> after they had reached the top. Many men were wounded and every-
> one but Doss took cover; but he remained exposed to enemy fire
> while caring for the wounded. During the night Doss's unit was
> forced back down the cliff, but Doss remained on the summit, where
> he proceeded to lower seventy-five soldiers down the face of the
> cliff by means of a rope. The heroics of Desmond Doss were still
> not concluded. After he had saved his seventy-five companions,
> he was wounded in both legs and while being carried off the field
> in a litter one of his bearers was wounded and Doss crawled off
> the litter and made the other wounded man take his place. Doss
> was then hit in the arm by a sniper's bullet and was eventually
> carried off on a litter. President Truman, on 12 October 1945,
> awarded Desmond Doss the Congressional Medal of Honor. Doss re-
> mains the only "conscientious objector" to ever be so honored.[4]

---

[4]Davis, p. 216.

Not without some justification, Desmond Doss has become some-
what of a "patron saint" for Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy.
Although he refused to bear arms, he ministered to the immediate medi-
cal needs of dying men. Actions such as his have convinced noncom-
batants that they are correct in their insistence that

> To refuse to participate at all [in war] is to refuse to go and
> help save life where men are dying. To refuse to participate is
> to pass by on the other side and let the wounded man die where he
> is, instead of like the good Samaritan doing all we can to alle-
> viate human suffering.[5]

NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF NONCOMBATANCY

Like everything which participates in humanity's frailty,
Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy exhibits weaknesses as well as
strengths. This section of the present chapter concentrates upon three
of its most closely related weaknesses which, in the writer's estima-
tion, are quite significant. It will be noted, however, that these
negative features are not unique to the position under consideration.
Instead, they appear, in greater or lesser degrees, in most dualistic
attempts to relate the claims of Christ to the claims of culture.

Privatism

The ministers who were surveyed in the preparation of this
dissertation seem to be divided in their opinions regarding the

---

[5]Paul Heubach, "Christianity and War" (Washington: National
Service Organization of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adven-
tists, 1968), p. 6.

legitimate scope of Christianity's moral concern. Forty-four percent

believe that the Christian moral conscience should focus exclusively

upon the conduct of individual persons while fifty-three percent indi-

cated that it should concern itself with the behavior of corporate

governments as well as the conduct of individuals.[6]

Those ministers who indicated that Christianity should limit

the scope of its moral concern to the conduct of individuals seem to

stand in greater continuity with traditional noncombatancy for the

stance has asserted that it "concerns itself only with the individual's

accountability and relationship to God."[7] It has therefore focused

almost without exception upon the private battlefield relationship

between the individual noncombatant offering medical service and the

wounded soldier in need of assistance. One representative document

declares to young Adventists that

> The sick or wounded soldier is a human being in need of help. He
> is your neighbor in the same sense as the man who was cared for by
> the Samaritan in Christ's parable. When he is whole again, perhaps
> as a result of care you have given him, he will make his own de-
> cision on his future course of action. At this point you are no
> more responsible for what he does than you are responsible for the
> action of the man who lives next door to you at home. In his hour
> of need you were there to minister and to witness to him.[8]

This strikes the writer as a necessary but insufficient

---

[6]Cf. p. 58.

[7]National Service Organization, *Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.), p. 18.

[8]National Service Organization, *Military Service and You* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1972), p. 7.

emphasis. It largely fails to discuss the wider implications of the
noncombatant's participation in military life. The writer believes
that the relationships between the noncombatant's activities and the
orientation of many military organizations deserve greater clarifica-
tion than paragraphs such as the one just cited seem to offer.

Quietism

Seventy-six percent of the ministers surveyed in the prepara-
tion of this dissertation believe that Christian churches should con-
centrate upon religious and spiritual reform alone. Only twenty-one
percent of the ministers believe that the Christian churches should
encourage political and economic reform as well as religious and spiri-
tual reform.[9]

These trends correspond with certain of noncombatancy's tradi-
tional emphases for it has frequently implied that Christians should
refrain from protesting any possible governmental perversities. Indi-
vidual Adventists have been advised, for instance, that Christians

> are not to concern themselves with deciding whether rulers govern
> well or ill, or whether their private lives are good or bad. The
> one thing that matters is that rulers are there to administer the
> law, and as such are to be respected and obeyed.[10]

If a government commands him to violate his conscientious convictions,
the ideal noncombatant "does not resist authority. He is still in

---

[9]Cf. pp. 58, 59.

[10]National Service Organization, *Why Seventh-day Adventists
Observe the Bible Sabbath* (Washington: General Conference of Seventh-
day Adventists, n.d.), p. 19.

subjection. He disobeys, but he quietly and unresistingly takes the consequences."[11] Even the church cannot be expected to raise its voice against irresponsible governmental actions for it "leaves with the administering agents of the government the decision on how to use its police powers."[12]

Such formulations seem to provide an opportunity for governments to pursue any policy, no matter how irresponsible or unjust, without public censure from the Christian community. Such an opportunity would not be, in the writer's view, in the best interests of the state, churches, or general society.

Parallelism

Antecedent to noncombatancy's privatism and quietism is its parallelism. Dualistic attempts to relate the claims of Christ to the claims of culture have often experienced the temptation to substitute two parallel moral standards, one for temporal matters and the other for spiritual matters, for a dynamic interaction between the two loci of moral authority.[13] That the position under consideration has not fully refrained from yielding to this temptation may be inferred from the following passage:

The church represents spiritual matters between God and man

---

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 21.

[12]National Service Organization, *Military Service and You*, p. 5.

[13]H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1956), p. 179.

and spiritual matters between men. It administers in the spiritual realm. The state, on the other hand, represents outward or material matters between men. It administers these material relationships. . .You then have membership in, and obligations to, two somewhat parallel institutions: church and state. . .Ideally, these two institutions should be parallel. It is only when one reaches across into the realm of the other that conflict develops. . .Thus your Church respects government acting in its sphere of authority, and refrains from interferring with matters that appropriately belong to it. . .War is an instrument in the hand of the government. Your church believes that it is not its prerogative to make a judgment as to whether or not nations should enter into war, whether general or particular.[14]

It would be convenient if it were possible clearly to distinguish between spiritual and material matters assigning the former to the churches and the latter to the governments for administration. If over emphasized, however, such distinctions can, in the writer's estimation, falsely bifurcate moral experience. Particular decisions with regard to spiritual matters often entail corresponding decisions with regard to material matters. Likewise, many civil or material matters are fraught with spiritual issues. What is needed, it seems, is not a rigid parallelism which prevents conversation but a continuing dialogue between free institutions.

FACETS OF A RECOMMENDATION

This final section of the present chapter includes the writer's proposal. Although it is a single proposal, it possesses three facets. The writer offers it in the hopes that the consideration of the issues it raises will improve Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy.

---

[14]National Service Organization, *Military Service and You*, pp. 3, 4.

Retention

For more than one hundred years denominational leaders have suggested that Adventists refrain from enlisting in any of the armed forces but consent to participate in those aspects of military life which do not necessitate direct and personal participation in the destruction of human life, if drafted. Thus noncombatancy has established a certain historical precedence in Adventist circles.

The survey administered in the preparation of this dissertation spotted strong support for the position among contemporary Seventh-day Adventist ministers in the United States. Eighty-seven percent of the ministers consider themselves to be noncombatants while only ten percent understand themselves to be either selective or absolute pacifists.[15] If the attitudes of these ministers are at all representative of the attitudes of Adventist laymen, it would seem that noncombatancy enjoys continuing popularity in Adventist circles.

Noncombatancy embodies several positive features. It has saved the denomination from violent pendulum swinging between the poles of pacifism and militarism. It has contributed to denominational solidarity both nationally and internationally. It has also provided an opportunity for young Adventists to render humanitarian service to those left bleeding on battlefields all over the world.

For these reasons, the writer believes that Seventh-day Adventism would do well to continue its noncombatant tradition. In his

---

[15]Cf. pp. 63, 64.

estimation, the values to be gained from a policy which emphasizes continuity are more significant than the values to be gained from a policy which emphasizes radical alterations in the denomination's stance with respect to participation in war.

Pluralization

With respect to monism or pluralism in denominational policy regarding participation in war, at least three alternatives seem possible.

First, the denomination could be monistic in its recommendations and monistic in its implementations. In such a case, those who find themselves in disagreement with the denomination's position could either opt to leave its fellowship or be satisfied with minimal participation and leadership opportunities within the denomination.

Second, the denomination could be pluralistic in its recommendations and pluralistic in its implementations. If this course were followed, the denomination would describe several possible positions on participation in war. It would also establish procedures, facilities, and personnel to assist Adventists to obtain the classifications they desire.

Third, the denomination could be monistic in its recommendations and pluralistic in its implementations. In this case, it would promote one stance and yet establish the procedures, facilities, and personnel to help Adventists receive the classifications they desire even though these desires do not always coincide with denominational recommendations.

Because the writer prefers the third alternative, he is grati-

fied to recognize that the most recent official Seventh-day Adventist

statement on participation in war strongly emphasizes the necessity for

individual Adventists to come to their own conclusions regarding parti-

cipation in war.[16] He hopes that special measures will be initiated to

guarantee that a genuine pluralism develops on the level of implemen-

tation so that no Adventist will feel confined to minimal participa-

tion and leadership opportunities within the denomination because of

his personal convictions with respect to warfare.

Reinterpretation

The writer believes that noncombatancy's privatism, quietism,

and parallelism add nothing and subtract much from its attractiveness.

He therefore hopes that future interpretations and expositions of the

stance will seek to minimize these tendencies.

One step in this direction would be to delete passages which

exhibit these features from future denominational publications which

expound Adventism's position on participation in war. It seems within

the realm of the possible to recommend that Adventists refrain from

enlisting but consent to participate in those aspects of military life

which do not necessitate personal and direct participation in the

destruction of human life without promoting privatistic, quietistic,

or parallelistic views.

---

[16]National Service Organization, *Military Service and You*,
pp. 1, 2, 7.

An additional step would be to encourage investigation, reflection, and formulation regarding the relationships between the individual and the historical context of his actions, between Christianity and society in general, and between spirituality and materiality. Such activity can only strengthen the viability of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy.

SUMMARY AND REMAINING QUESTIONS

This dissertation reviewed the history of Seventh-day Adventist noncombatancy. It also discussed the procedures utilized and trends identified in the administration of a survey of the attitudes of Adventist ministers in America toward participation in war. The dissertation also suggested that Adventism's traditional position on warfare can be understood as a manifestation of the dualistic attempt to relate the claims of Christ to the claims of culture.

In this chapter the writer, confessing his own subjectivity and relativity, offered an evaluation of the position. He suggested that its positive features include its consistency, functionality, and generosity. He suggested that its negative features include its privatism, quietism, and parallelism. Finally, he proposed that the denomination retain, pluralize, and reinterpret its traditional position regarding participation in war.

Several questions remained to be answered. Is there a significant variation between the attitudes of the mature ordained Seventh-day Adventist ministers and the attitudes of their younger unordained colleagues regarding participation in war? Is there a significant

variation between the attitudes of Adventist clergymen and Adventist laymen on this issue? Is there a significant variation between the attitudes surveyed in the preparation of this dissertation and the attitudes of Adventist clergymen who do not reside within the United States? These additional questions provide possibilities for further investigation and reflection.

APPENDIXES

[137]

APPENDIX A

THE LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL AND QUESTIONNAIRE

April 27, 1972
22633 Barton Rd.
Colton, CA. 92324

Dear Seventh-day Adventist Minister:

As part of my study toward a professional degree in religion, I am attempting to ascertain the attitudes of contemporary Seventh-day Adventist ministers toward participation in war. I am also attempting to see how these attitudes relate to the ministers' understanding of man's moral nature and to their personal experience. I am sending, therefore, a query to a sample of ministers employed on all levels of the denomination. Your name was chosen in a process of random selection.

Would you assist me in this research by completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest possible convenience? You need not sign your name. The questionnaires are not coded for I have no desire to know your identity. Neither do I have any desire to condemn or condone any person or group of persons. I merely seek to understand the thinking of my colleagues.

I will greatly appreciate any time, effort, and consideration you are able to give to me to make this project a success. Thank you for your help.

A self-addressed business reply envelope is enclosed. It requires no postage stamps from you.

Sincerely,

David Larson
Associate Pastor
Azure Hills S.D.A. Church
Colton, CA. 92324

Enclosures

HUMAN NATURE, PARTICIPATION IN WAR, AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

(A Questionnaire)

Directions: Please answer each of the following questions as best you can by placing a mark beside the one answer which is most appropriate. This questionnaire may be returned to David Larson in care of the Azure Hills Seventh-day Adventist Church, 22633 Barton Rd., Colton, CA. 92324.

Man's Moral Nature

1. I believe that human beings are
   _____ inclined toward evil
   _____ inclined toward good
   _____ both of these
   _____ neither of these

2. I believe that sin is
   _____ a specific violation of moral law
   _____ a general state of alientation and estrangement
   _____ both of these
   _____ neither of these

3. I believe that divine grace includes
   _____ forgiveness for sin
   _____ power to overcome sin
   _____ both of these
   _____ neither of these

4. I believe that Christian perfection is
   _____ a process of continuing maturity
   _____ a state of absolute sinlessness
   _____ both of these
   _____ neither of these

5. I believe that via divine power man can attain absolute sinlessness in this life
   _____ always
   _____ usually
   _____ occasionally
   _____ never

6. I believe that in this life one must choose the lesser of two evils
   _____ always
   _____ usually
   _____ occasionally
   _____ never

7. I believe that Christianity's sphere of proper concern includes
   _____ the moral behavior of corporate governments
   _____ the moral behavior of individual citizens
   _____ both of these
   _____ neither of these

8. I believe that the church's proper role is to encourage
   _____ political and economic reform
   _____ religious and spiritual reform
   _____ both of these
   _____ neither of these

9. I believe that the degree of my certainty regarding my understanding of man's moral nature is best described as
   _____ very certain
   _____ certain
   _____ neither certain nor uncertain
   _____ uncertain
   _____ very uncertain

Participation in War

Combatancy: The willingness to participate in any aspect of any war in which one's country may engage.

Noncombatancy: The unwillingness to participate in those aspects of war which entail the direct destruction of human life.

Selective Pacifism: The unwillingness to participate in any aspect of those wars one considers unwarranted.

Absolute Pacifism: The unwillingness to participate in any aspect of any war in which one's country may engage.

10. I believe that from a Christian perspective *combatancy* is
    _____ highly moral
    _____ moral
    _____ neither moral nor immoral
    _____ immoral
    _____ highly immoral

11. I believe that from a pragmatic perspective *combatancy* is
    _____ highly practical
    _____ practical
    _____ neither practical nor impractical
    _____ impractical
    _____ highly impractical

12. I believe that from a Christian perspective *noncombatancy* is
_____ highly moral
_____ moral
_____ neither moral nor immoral
_____ immoral
_____ highly immoral

13. I believe that from a pragmatic perspective *noncombatancy*
_____ highly practical
_____ practical
_____ neither practical nor impractical
_____ impractical
_____ highly impractical

14. I believe that from a Christian perspective *selective pacifism* is
_____ highly moral
_____ moral
_____ neither moral nor immoral
_____ immoral
_____ highly immoral

15. I believe that from a pragmatic perspective *selective pacifism* is
_____ highly practical
_____ practical
_____ neither practical nor impractical
_____ impractical
_____ highly impractical

16. I believe that from a Christian perspective *absolute pacifism* is
_____ highly moral
_____ moral
_____ neither moral nor immoral
_____ immoral
_____ highly immoral

17. I believe that from a pragmatic perspective *absolute pacifism* is
_____ highly practical
_____ practical
_____ neither practical nor impractical
_____ impractical
_____ highly impractical

18. I believe that my own position regarding participation in war is best described as
    _____combatancy
    _____noncombatancy
    _____selective pacifism
    _____absolute pacifism

19. I believe that the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists should approve of
    _____combatancy
    _____noncombatancy
    _____selective pacifism
    _____absolute pacifism
    _____several of these (please specify) _____
    _____all of these
    _____none of these

20. I believe that the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists should support national legislation permitting
    _____combatancy
    _____noncombatancy
    _____selective pacifism
    _____absolute pacifism
    _____several of these (please specify) _____
    _____all of these
    _____none of these

21. I believe that the degree of my certainty regarding my position on participation in war is best described as
    _____very certain
    _____certain
    _____neither certain nor uncertain
    _____uncertain
    _____very uncertain

Personal Experience

22. I am
    _____less than 25 years old
    _____between 25 and 35 years old
    _____between 35 and 45 years old
    _____between 45 and 55 years old
    _____between 55 and 65 years old
    _____more than 65 years old

23. I am a
   _____ first generation S.D.A.
   _____ second generation S.D.A.
   _____ third generation S.D.A.
   _____ fourth generation S.D.A.
   _____ fifth generation S.D.A.
   _____ sixth generation S.D.A.
   _____ seventh generation S.D.A.

24. I have earned a
   _____ grade school diploma
   _____ high school diploma
   _____ bachelor's degree
   _____ master's degree
   _____ seminary degree (B.D., M.Div., or equivalent)
   _____ academic or professional doctorate

25. I have received the following amount of training from the
   S.D.A. Medical Cadet Corps
   _____ very much
   _____ some
   _____ very little
   _____ none

26. I have the following number of children who have been, are,
   or will be eligible for military work
   _____ none
   _____ one
   _____ two
   _____ three
   _____ four or more

27. I have
   _____ served in the military as a combatant
   _____ served in the military as a noncombatant
   _____ not been asked to serve in the military
   _____ refused to serve in the military

28. I served in
   _____ the Army
   _____ the Air Force
   _____ the Marine Corps
   _____ the Navy
   _____ some other branch of the military
   _____ several of these (please specify) _____
   _____ none of these

29. I served in the military in
_____ World War I
_____ World War II
_____ the Korean War
_____ the Viet Nam War
_____ several of these (please specify) _____
_____ none of these

30. I am now employed by
_____ a local conference
_____ a union conference
_____ an educational, medical, or publishing institution
_____ the General Conference

APPENDIX B

Tables 1-4: The Population, Sample, and Returns

Table 1

THE ORGANIZATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION AND SAMPLE

Organization	Population	Sample
Ordained clergymen employed by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists	106	21
Ordained clergymen employed by the various Union Conferences of Seventh-day Adventists in the United States of America		
Atlantic Union	26	6
Central Union	11	2
Columbia Union	20	4
Lake Union	15	3
North Pacific Union	16	2
Northern Union	6	1
Pacific Union	39	8
Southern Union	25	4
Southwestern Union	12	2
Ordained clergymen employed by Selected Seventh-day Adventist Institutions in the United States of America		
Christian Record Braille Foundation	6	1
Pacific Press Publishing Association	14	3
Review and Herald Publishing Association	12	2
Southern Publishing Association	7	2
Andrews University	49	8
Atlantic Union College	9	1
Columbia Union College	16	3
Kettering Memorial College	9	2
Loma Linda University	48	9
Oakwood College	15	3
Pacific Union College	17	3
Southern Missionary College	11	2
Southwestern Union College	14	3
Union College	16	3
Walla Walla College	15	3

Table 1 (Continued)

Organization	Population	Sample
Ordained clergymen employed by Local Conferences and Missions of Seventh-day Adventists in the United States of America		
Alabama	25	5
Alaska	3	0
Allegheny East	29	5
Allegheny West	16	3
Arizona	30	6
Arkansas-Louisiana	23	4
Carolina	36	7
Central California	110	21
Central States	13	2
Chesapeake	27	5
Colorado	45	9
Florida	63	12
Georgia-Cumberland	53	11
Greater New York	36	7
Hawaii	21	4
Idaho	17	3
Illinois	41	8
Indiana	32	6
Iowa	19	3
Kansas	18	3
Kentucky-Tennessee	38	7
Lake Region	20	4
Michigan	108	21
Minnesota	28	5
Missouri	21	4
Montana	16	3
Nebraska	23	4
Nevada-Utah	17	3
New Jersey	24	4
New York	26	5
North Dakota	16	3
Northeastern	39	7

Table 1 (Continued)

Organization	Population	Sample
Northern California	121	24
Northern New England	19	3
Ohio	52	10
Oklahoma	26	10
Oregon	98	19
Potomac	64	12
Pennsylvania	46	9
South Atlantic	28	5
South Central	23	4
South Dakota	10	2
Southeastern California	104	21
Southern California	136	27
Southern New England	40	8
Southwest Region	18	3
Texas	60	12
Texico	17	3
Upper Columbia	50	10
Washington	43	8
West Virginia	8	1
Wisconsin	22	4
Wyoming	11	2
TOTALS	2563	492

Table 2

THE CHRONOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE RETURNS

Postmarked Dates (1972)	Number	Percent
Postmarked Dates Illegible	44	17
May 1 - 8	118	45
May 9 - 16	59	22
May 17 - 24	22	8
May 25 - June 1	11	4
June 2 - 9	4	1
June 10 - 25	1	---
June 26 - July 15	3	1

Table 3

THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION,
SAMPLE, AND RETURNS

Postmarked Locations	Population	Sample	Returns
Postmarked Locations Illegible			52
Central Plains & Mountains	243	44	16
Great Lakes	287	54	31
Middle Atlantic	429	81	23
Atlantic Northeast	195	37	8
Pacific Northwest	258	48	23
Pacific West	657	129	74
Southeast	324	62	22
Southwest	170	37	13
TOTALS	2563	492	262

Table 4

THE STRATOUS DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION,
SAMPLE, AND RETURNS

Strata	Population	Sample	Returns
General Conference	106	21	22
Union Conferences	170	32	19
Selected Institutions	258	48	48
Local Conferences	2029	391	170
Data Unavailable	____	____	3
TOTALS	2563	492	262

APPENDIX C

Tables 5-13: The Ministers' Theological Opinions

Table 5

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE MORAL INCLINATION OF HUMAN BEINGS (Question 1)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	1	---
Inclined toward evil	162	62
Inclined toward good	5	2
Both of these	93	35
Neither of these	1	---

Table 6

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SIN (Question 2)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	4	1
Specific violation of moral law	109	42
General state of alienation and estrangement	18	7
Both of these	131	50
Neither of these	---	---

Table 7

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE
INCLUSIVENESS OF GRACE (Question 3)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	2	1
Includes forgiveness for sin	18	7
Includes power to overcome sin	11	4
Both of these	231	88
Neither of these	---	---

Table 8

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE NATURE
OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION (Question 4)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	1	---
A process of continuing maturity	218	83
A state of absolute sinlessness	5	2
Both of these	34	13
Neither of these	4	1

Table 9

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE POSSIBILITY
OF ATTAINING ABSOLUTE SINLESSNESS IN THIS LIFE
VIA DIVINE POWER (Question 5)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	31	12
Always possible	99	38
Usually possible	24	9
Occasionally possible	18	7
Never possible	90	34

Table 10

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE NECESSITY OF
CHOOSING THE LESSER OF TWO EVILS (Question 6)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	16	6
Always Necessary	25	9
Usually Necessary	12	4
Occasionally Necessary	91	35
Never Necessary	118	45

Table 11

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE SPHERE OF
CHRISTIANITY'S PROPER CONCERN (Question 7)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	1	---
Moral behavior of corporate governments	4	1
Moral behavior of individual citizens	116	44
Both of these	139	53
Neither of these	2	1

Table 12

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE CHRISTIAN
CHURCH'S PROPER ROLE IN SOCIETY (Question 8)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	3	1
Encourage political and economic reform	1	---
Encourage religious and spiritual reform	199	76
Both of these	54	21
Neither of these	5	2

Table 13

THE MINISTERS' OPINIONS REGARDING THE DEGREE OF
THEIR THEOLOGICAL CERTAINTY (Question 9)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	6	2
Very certain	120	46
Certain	119	46
Neither certain nor uncertain	16	6
Uncertain	1	---
Very uncertain	---	---

APPENDIX D

Tables 14-25: The Ministers' Ethical Attitudes

Table 14

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF
COMBATANCY (Question 10)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	13	5
Highly Moral	5	2
Moral	11	4
Neither Moral nor Immoral	51	19
Immoral	117	45
Highly Immoral	65	25

Table 15

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY
COMBATANCY (Question 11)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	24	9
Highly practical	22	8
Practical	76	29
Neither practical nor impractical	53	20
Impractical	50	19
Highly impractical	37	14

Table 16

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF
NONCOMBATANCY (Question 12)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	5	2
Highly moral	101	38
Moral	121	46
Neither moral nor immoral	29	11
Immoral	3	1
Highly immoral	3	1

Table 17

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY
OF NONCOMBATANCY (Question 13)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	15	6
Highly practical	55	21
Practical	118	45
Neither practical nor impractical	37	14
Impractical	29	11
Highly impractical	8	3

Table 18

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF
SELECTIVE PACIFISM (Question 14)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	18	7
Highly moral	15	6
Moral	56	21
Neither moral nor immoral	103	39
Immoral	57	22
Highly immoral	13	5

Table 19

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY
OF SELECTIVE PACIFISM (Question 15)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	23	9
Highly practical	7	3
Practical	38	14
Neither practical nor impractical	53	20
Impractical	104	40
Highly impractical	37	14

Table 20

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF
ABSOLUTE PACIFISM (Question 16)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	14	5
Highly moral	29	11
Moral	50	19
Neither moral nor immoral	81	31
Immoral	64	24
Highly immoral	24	9

Table 21

THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY
OF ABSOLUTE PACIFISM (Question 17)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	23	9
Highly practical	13	5
Practical	20	8
Neither practical nor impractical	43	16
Impractical	99	38
Highly impractical	64	24

Table 22

THE MINISTERS' PERSONAL POSITIONS VIS A VIS
PARTICIPATION IN WAR (Question 18)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	7	3
Combatancy	---	---
Noncombatancy	227	87
Selective Pacifism	16	6
Absolute Pacifism	12	4

Table 23

THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE POSITIONS VIS A VIS
PARTICIPATION IN WAR MERITING APPROVAL
FROM THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF
SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS
(Question 19)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	11	4
Combatancy	---	---
Noncombatancy	163	62
Selective pacifism	9	3
Absolute pacifism	3	1
Several of these	58	22
All of these	9	3
None of these	9	3

Table 24

THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE POSITIONS VIS A VIS
PARTICIPATION IN WAR MERITING LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT
FROM THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF SEVENTH-DAY
ADVENTISTS (Question 20)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	16	6
Combatancy	---	---
Noncombatancy	145	55
Selective Pacifism	12	4
Absolute Pacifism	5	2
Several of These	48	18
All of These	.13	5
None of These	23	9

Table 25

THE MINISTERS' DEGREES OF CERTAINTY REGARDING
THEIR POSITIONS ON PARTICIPATION IN WAR
(Question 21)

Response	Number	Percent
No Response	5	2
Very Certain	108	41
Certain	123	47
Neither Certain nor Uncertain	16	6
Uncertain	9	3
Very Uncertain	1	---

APPENDIX E

Tables 26-34: The Ministers' Personal Attributes

Table 26

THE MINISTERS' AGES (Question 22)

Responses	Number	Percent
No response	1	---
Less than 25 years old	---	---
25-35 years old	18	7
35-45 years old	55	21
45-55 years old	104	40
55-65 years old	70	27
More than 65 years old	14	5

Table 27

THE MINISTERS' S.D.A. HERITAGES (Question 23)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	1	---
First generation S.D.A.	79	30
Second generation S.D.A.	99	38
Third generation S.D.A.	70	27
Fourth generation S.D.A.	9	3
Fifth generation S.D.A.	4	1
Sixth generation S.D.A.	---	---
Seventh generation S.D.A.	---	---

Table 28

THE MINISTERS' EDUCATIONAL LEVELS (Question 24)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	2	1
Grade School Diploma	---	---
High School Diploma	15	6
Bachelor's Degree	129	49
Master's Degree	67	25
Seminary Degree (B.D., M.Div. or equivalent)	24	9
Academic or Professional doctorate	25	9

Table 29

THE AMOUNTS OF THE MINISTERS'' MEDICAL CADET
CORPS TRAINING (Question 25)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	4	1
Very much	32	12
Some	94	36
Very little	17	6
None	115	44

Table 30

THE NUMBER OF THE MINISTERS' CONSCRIPTABLE
OFFSPRING (Question 26)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	2	1
None	73	28
One	91	35
Two	66	25
Three	17	6
Four or more	13	5

Table 31

THE CLASSIFICATIONS OF THE MINISTERS' MILITARY
EXPERIENCE (Question 27)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	6	2
Served as combatant	23	9
Served as noncombatant	46	18
Not been asked to serve in the military	185	71
Refused to serve in the military	2	1

Table 32

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS OF THE MINISTERS'
MILITARY EXPERIENCE (Question 28)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	27	10
Army	48	18
Air Force	8	3
Marine Corps	2	1
Navy	10	4
Some other branch of the military	2	1
Several of these	---	---
None of these	165	63

Table 33

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXTS OF THE MINISTERS'
MILITARY EXPERIENCE (Question 29)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	31	12
World War I	1	---
World War II	56	21

Table 33 (Continued)

Response	Number	Percent
The Korean War	9	3
The Viet Nam War	1	---
Several of these	---	---
None of these	164	63

Table 34

THE MINISTERS' PRESENT PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS
(Question 30)

Response	Number	Percent
No response	3	1
Local Conference	170	65
Union Conference	19	7
Educational, medical, or publishing institution	48	18
General Conference	22	8

APPENDIX F

Tables 35-47: The Ministers' Opinions, Attitudes, and Attributes in Relation

Table 35

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY OF COMBATANCY (Question 11) TO THEIR ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF COMBATANCY (Question 10)

	No Response	Highly Moral	Moral	Neither Moral nor Immoral	Immoral	Highly Immoral	TOTALS
No response	11 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (5)	4 (11)	8 (6)	24
Highly practical	0 (1)	2 (0)	2 (1)	3 (4)	11 (10)	4 (6)	22
Practical	0 (4)	0 (1)	7 (3)	21 (14)	40 (34)	8 (19)	76
Neither practical nor impractical	0 (3)	0 (1)	0 (2)	22 (10)	21 (24)	10 (13)	53
Impractical	1 (2)	1 (1)	1 (2)	4 (10)	33 (22)	10 (12)	50
Highly impractical	1 (2)	2 (1)	0 (1)	1 (7)	8 (16)	25 (9)	37
TOTALS	13	5	11	51	117	65	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 191.620   Degrees of Freedom: 25   Level of Significance: .0000000

Table 36

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY OF NONCOMBATANCY (Question 13) TO THEIR ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF NONCOMBATANCY (Question 12)

	No Response	Highly Moral	Moral	Neither Moral nor Immoral	Immoral	Highly Immoral	TOTALS
No response	5 (0)	5 (6)	5 (7)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15
Highly practical	0 (1)	44 (21)	9 (25)	2 (6)	0 (1)	0 (1)	55
Practical	0 (2)	26 (45)	79 (54)	11 (13)	1 (1)	1 (1)	118
Neither practical nor impractical	0 (1)	11 (14)	16 (17)	10 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	37
Impractical	0 (0)	10 (11)	11 (13)	5 (3)	2 (0)	1 (0)	29
Highly Impractical	0 (0)	5 (3)	1 (4)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)	8
TOTALS	5	101	121	29	3	3	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 177.679   Degrees of Freedom: 25   Level of Significance: .0000000

164

Table 37

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY OF SELECTIVE PACIFISM (Question 15) TO THEIR ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF SELECTIVE PACIFISM (Question 14)

	No Response	Highly Moral	Moral	Neither Moral nor Immoral	Immoral	Highly Immoral	TOTALS
No response	12 (2)	1 (1)	5 (5)	5 (9)	0 (5)	0 (1)	23
Highly practical	1 (0)	3 (0)	1 (1)	0 (3)	1 (1)	1 (0)	7
Practical	1 (3)	4 (2)	20 (8)	9 (15)	4 (8)	0 (2)	38
Neither practical nor impractical	0 (4)	2 (3)	4 (11)	42 (21)	4 (11)	1 (3)	53
Impractical	4 (7)	3 (6)	24 (22)	38 (41)	33 (23)	2 (5)	104
Highly impractical	0 (2)	2 (2)	2 (8)	9 (14)	15 (8)	9 (2)	37
TOTALS	18	15	56	103	57	13	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 213.905   Degrees of Freedom: 25   Level of Significance: .0000000

165

Table 38

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE PRACTICALITY OF ABSOLUTE PACIFISM (Question 17) TO THEIR ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF ABSOLUTE PACIFISM (Question 16)

	No Response	Highly Moral	Moral	Neither Moral nor Immoral	Immoral	Highly Immoral	TOTALS
No response	11 (1)	3 (2)	5 (4)	4 (7)	0 (6)	0 (2)	23
Highly Practical	0 (1)	9 (1)	1 (2)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1 (1)	13
Practical	0 (1)	4 (2)	16 (4)	0 (6)	0 (5)	0 (2)	20
Neither Practical Nor Impractical	0 (2)	2 (5)	4 (8)	32 (13)	3 (10)	2 (4)	43
Impractical	3 (5)	5 (11)	18 (19)	32 (31)	39 (24)	2 (9)	99
Highly Impractical	0 (3)	6 (7)	6 (12)	12 (20)	21 (16)	19 (6)	64
TOTALS	14	29	50	81	64	24	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 285.039   Degrees of Freedom: 25   Level of Significance: .0000000

166

Table 39

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVES MERITING APPROVAL FROM
THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS (Question 19) TO THEIR OPINIONS
REGARDING THE NATURE OF SIN (Question 2)

	No Response	Violation of Moral Law	State of Estrangement	Both of These	Neither of These	TOTALS
No response	0 (0)	4 (5)	2 (1)	5 (5)	0 (0)	11
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	3 (2)	85 (68)	8 (11)	67 (81)	0 (0)	163
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	3 (4)	1 (1)	5 (4)	0 (0)	9
Absolute Pacifism	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (0)	3
Several of These	0 (1)	13 (24)	3 (4)	42 (29)	0 (0)	58
All of These	0 (0)	1 (4)	3 (1)	5 (4)	0 (0)	9
None of These	1 (0)	2 (4)	1 (1)	5 (4)	0 (0)	9
TOTALS	4	109	18	131	0	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate
expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 41.320   Degrees of Freedom: 18   Level of Significance: .0013748

Table 40

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVES MERITING LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT FROM THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS (Question 20) TO THEIR VIEWS REGARDING THE NATURE OF SIN (Question 2)

	No Response	Violation of Moral Law	State of Es- trangement	Both of These	Neither of These	TOTALS
No response	0 (0)	7 (6)	1 (1)	8 (8)	0 (0)	16
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	3 (2)	73 (60)	9 (10)	60 (72)	0 (0)	145
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	3 (5)	3 (1)	6 (6)	0 (0)	12
Absolute Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	5 (2)	0 (0)	5
Several of These	0 (1)	11 (20)	2 (3)	35 (24)	0 (0)	48
All of These	1 (0)	2 (5)	3 (1)	7 (6)	0 (0)	13
None of These	0 (0)	13 (10)	0 (1)	10 (11)	0 (0)	23
TOTALS	4	109	18	131	0	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 41.246   Degrees of Freedom: 18   Level of Significance: .0014079

168

Table 41

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' PERSONAL POSITIONS VIS A VIS PARTICIPATION IN WAR (Question 18)
TO THEIR OPINIONS REGARDING THE CHURCH'S PROPER ROLE IN SOCIETY (Question 8)

	No Response	Political and Economic Reform	Religious and Spiritual Reform	Both of These	Neither of These	TOTALS
No Response	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (5)	4 (1)	0 (0)	7
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	2 (3)	1 (1)	180 (172)	39 (47)	5 (4)	227
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (12)	5 (3)	0 (0)	16
Absolute Pacifism	1 (0)	0 (0)	5 (9)	6 (2)	0 (0)	12
TOTALS	3	1	199	54	5	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 21.788   Degrees of Freedom: 12   Level of Significance: .0399695

Table 42

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVES MERITING APPROVAL FROM THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS (Question 19) TO THEIR OPINIONS REGARDING THE CHURCH'S PROPER ROLE IN SOCIETY (Question 8)

	No Response	Political and Economic Reform	Religious and Spiritual Reform	Both of These	Neither of These	TOTALS
No Response	0 (0)	1 (0)	7 (8)	3 (2)	0 (0)	11
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	2 (2)	0 (1)	137 (124)	20 (34)	4 (3)	163
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (7)	2 (2)	0 (0)	9
Absolute Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	1 (1)	0 (0)	3
Several of These	0 (1)	0 (0)	37 (44)	21 (12)	0 (1)	58
All of These	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (7)	4 (2)	0 (0)	9
None of These	1 (0)	0 (0)	4 (7)	3 (2)	1 (0)	9
TOTALS	3	1	199	54	5	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 58.111   Degrees of Freedom: 24   Level of Significance: .0001174

Table 43

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVES MERITING APPROVAL FROM THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS (Question 19) TO THEIR AGES (Question 22)

	No Response	-25	25-35	35-45	45-55	55-65	65-	TOTALS
No Response	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)	6 (4)	3 (3)	0 (1)	11
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	0 (1)	0 (0)	8 (11)	29 (34)	66 (65)	49 (44)	11 (9)	163
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	3 (2)	4 (4)	2 (2)	0 (0)	9
Absolute Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	2 (2)	0 (1)	1 (0)	3
Several of These	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (4)	18 (12)	18 (23)	13 (15)	1 (3)	58
All of These	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	4 (2)	3 (4)	0 (2)	0 (0)	9
None of These	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (2)	5 (4)	3 (2)	1 (0)	9
TOTALS	1	0	18	55	104	70	14	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicated observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 58.953   Degrees of Freedom: 30   Level of Significance: .0012305

171

Table 44

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE MORALITY OF NONCOMBATANCY (Question 23) (Question 10) TO THEIR SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST HERITAGES

	No Response	First Genera. S.D.A.	Second Genera. S.D.A.	Third Genera. S.D.A.	Fourth Genera. S.D.A.	Fifth Genera. S.D.A.	TOTALS
No response	0 (0)	1 (1)	3 (2)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5
Highly moral	0 (0)	41 (30)	26 (38)	29 (27)	4 (3)	1 (1)	101
Moral	1 (0)	27 (36)	55 (46)	32 (32)	4 (4)	2 (2)	121
Neither moral nor immoral	0 (0)	7 (9)	15 (11)	7 (8)	0 (1)	0 (0)	29
Immoral	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (1)	0 (1)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3
Highly Immoral	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (1)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3
TOTALS	1	79	99	70	9	4	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 50.282   Degrees of Freedom: 25   Level of Significance: .0019668

Table 45

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVES MERITING APPROVAL FROM THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS (Question 19) TO THEIR SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST HERITAGES (Question 23)

	No Response	First Genera. S.D.A.	Second Genera. S.D.A.	Third Genera. S.D.A.	Fourth Genera. S.D.A.	Fifth Genera. S.D.A.	TOTALS
No Response	1 (0)	4 (3)	4 (4)	1 (3)	1 (0)	0 (0)	11
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	0 (1)	59 (49)	54 (62)	43 (43)	5 (6)	2 (2)	163
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	2 (3)	5 (3)	2 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9
Absolute Pacifism	0 (0)	2 (1)	1 (1)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3
Several of These	0 (0)	11 (17)	27 (22)	16 (15)	3 (2)	1 (1)	58
All of These	0 (0)	1 (3)	3 (3)	4 (2)	0 (0)	1 (0)	9
None of These	0 (0)	0 (3)	5 (3)	4 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9
TOTALS	1	79	99	70	9	4	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicated observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 49.271   Degrees of Freedom: 30   Level of Significance: .0147469

173

Table 46

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' PERSONAL POSITIONS VIS A VIS PARTICIPATION IN WAR
(Question 18) TO THE LEVELS OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE (Question 24)

	No Response	Grade School Diploma	High School Diploma	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Seminary Degree	Doctoral Degree	TOTALS
No Response	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (3)	0 (2)	1 (1)	2 (1)	7
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	1 (2)	0 (0)	14 (13)	116 (112)	60 (58)	17 (21)	19 (22)	227
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	5 (8)	5 (4)	4 (1)	1 (1)	16
Absolute Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	5 (6)	2 (3)	2 (1)	3 (1)	12
TOTALS	2	0	15	129	67	24	25	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 34.486   Degrees of Freedom: 15   Level of Significance: .0029097

174

Table 47

THE RELATION OF THE MINISTERS' VIEWS REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVES MERITING APPROVAL FROM THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS (Question 19) TO THE LEVELS OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES (Question 24)

	No Response	Grade School Diploma	High School Diploma	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Seminary Degree	Doctoral Degree	TOTALS
No Response	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	5 (5)	2 (3)	0 (1)	3 (1)	11
Combatancy	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Noncombatancy	0 (1)	0 (0)	12 (9)	90 (80)	42 (42)	10 (15)	9 (15)	163
Selective Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4)	4 (2)	1 (1)	1 (1)	9
Absolute Pacifism	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3
Several of These	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (3)	25 (29)	13 (15)	10 (5)	6 (5)	58
All of These	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	4 (2)	2 (1)	2 (1)	9
None of These	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4)	2 (2)	1 (1)	3 (1)	9
TOTALS	2	0	15	129	67	24	25	262

Note: Numbers without parentheses indicate observed frequencies and numbers within parentheses indicate expected frequencies.

Chi-square: 48.390   Degrees of Freedom: 30   Level of Significance: .0181179

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[176]

A. MANUSCRIPTS

Branson, Roy. "What is the Meaning of Noncombatancy?" Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University, c. 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Davis, Roger G. Personal correspondence with the writer, February 21, 1972.

Heubach, Paul. "Christianity and War." Washington: National Service Organization of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Smith, Clark. "Character Guidance Studies for the Seventh-day Adventist Medical Cadet Corps." Washington: National Service Organization of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

White, W. C., D. E. Robinson, and A. L. White. "The Spirit of Prophecy and Military Service." Washington: The Ellen G. White Estate of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1956. (Mimeographed.)

B. ARTICLES

Christenson, Reo M. "The Church and Public Policy," *Spectrum*, II (Summer 1970), 23-28.

Fenz, Emanuel G. "The Case for Conscientious Objection," *Spectrum*, I (Winter 1969), 50-55.

Hegstad, Roland. "The High Cost of Freedom," *Insight*, (October 24, 1972), 10-16.

Hoyt, Frederick G. "The Dehumanizing Effects of War," *Spectrum*, II (Summer 1970), 43-53.

Larson, David R. "Critique," rev. of *Military Service and You* (National Service Organization), *Insight*, (October 24, 1972), 22.

McAdams, Donald R. "A Defense of the Adventist Position," *Spectrum*, I (Winter 1969), 44-49.

Neff, Lavonne. "Who's in Charge Here?" *Insight*, (October 24, 1972), 11-17.

177

Ross, Gary M. "Christian Aspects of Diplomacy," *Spectrum*, II (Summer 1970), 29-42.

Scriven, Chuck. "The Case for Selective Nonpacifism," *Spectrum*, I (Winter 1969), 41-44.

Stirling, Betty. "Student Attitudes toward Missions," *Spectrum*, I (Spring 1969), 52-59.

Turner, Martin D. "Project Whitecoat," *Spectrum*, II (Summer 1970), 55-70.

White, James. "The Nation," *Review and Herald* (August 12, 1862), 84.

C. PAMPHLETS

Na
National Service Organization. *Filling Out the Special Form for Conscientious Objectors*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

_____. *From Civilian to Military Life: Calamity or Opportunity?* Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

_____. *Military Regulations and Procedure to Secure Noncombatant Assignment in the United States Armed Forces*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

_____. *Military Service and You*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1972

_____. *Questions and Answers for Those Facing the Draft*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

_____. *Religious Convictions of Seventh-day Adventist Personnel in the Armed Forces of the United States*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

_____. *Seventh-day Adventists and Civil Government*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

_____. *To Those Who Have Marching Orders*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

_____. *Why Seventh-day Adventists are Noncombatants*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, c. 1943.

_____. *Why Seventh-day Adventists Observe the Bible Sabbath*. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, n.d.

D. THESES

Chamberlain, Theadore J. "The Church and the City: A Social Psychological Study of Attitudes Toward Inner-city Work Among Seventh-day Adventist Leaders." Unpublished Master's thesis, Loma Linda University, 1971.

Davis, Roger G. "Conscientious Cooperators: The Seventh-day Adventists and Military Service, 1860-1945." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, George Washington University, 1970.

Ford, Robert E. "Racial Attitudes of Seventh-day Adventists in California." Unpublished Master's thesis, Loma Linda University, 1971.

Syme, Eric D. "Seventh-day Adventist Concepts on Church and State." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, American University, 1969.

E. BOOKS

1. Historical Perspectives

Compilations of Extracts from the Publications of Seventh-day Adventists Setting forth their Views of the Sinfulness of War. Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1865.

Courville, Cyril B., and Elmer W. Gilbert (eds.) *Medical Cadet Training Manual.* 2d. ed. Glendale, Calif.: Pacific Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1943.

Cross, Whitney R. *The Burned-Over District:* The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965.

Marty, Martin E. *Righteous Empire:* The Protestant Experience in America. New York: Dial Press, 1970.

Mead, Sidney E. *The Lively Experiment:* The Shaping of Christianity in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Nichol, Francis D. *The Midnight Cry:* A Defense of William Miller and the Millerites. Washington: Review and Herald, 1944.

_____. *Wartime Contribution of Seventh-day Adventists.* Washington: Review and Herald, 1943.

Seventh-day Adventist Church Manual. Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1967.

Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia. Washington: Review and Herald, 1966.

Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook: 1970. Washington: Review and Herald, 1971.

Smith, Timothy L. *Revivalism and Social Reform:* American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965.

Spalding, Arthur W. *Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists.* 4 vols. Washington: Review and Herald, 1962.

War Service Commission. *Studies in Denominational Principles of Noncombatancy and Governmental Relationships.* Washington: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1943.

White, Ellen G. *Selected Messages.* 2 vols. Washington: Review and Herald, 1958.

_____. *Testimonies for the Church.* 9 vols. Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1948.

Wilcox, Francis M. *Seventh-day Adventists in Time of War.* Washington: Review and Herald, 1936.

2. Sociological Perspectives

Faris, Robert E. L. (ed.) *Handbook of Modern Sociology.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Festinger, Leon, and Daniel Katzz (eds.) *Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences.* New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston, 1965.

Fisher, Ronald A. *Statistical Methods for Research Workers.* 8th. ed. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1941.

Freund, John E. *Modern Elementary Statistics.* 2d. ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Glock, Charles Y. (ed.) *Survey Research in the Social Sciences.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Jahoda, Marie, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook. *Research Methods in Social Relations.* 2 vols. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.

McCormick, Thomas C., and Roy G. Francis. *Methods of Research in the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Merton, Robert K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. rev. ed. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

Orr, John B., and F. Patrick Nichelson. *The Radical Suburb:* Soundings in Changing American Character. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

3. Theological and Ethical Perspectives

Bainton, Roland. *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peach:* A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. 4 vols. in 13. ed. and trans. by G. T. Thomson, G. W. Bromiley, T. F. Torrance, *et. al.* Edinburgh: Clark, 1936-1960.

Bennett, John C. *Foreign Policy in Christian Perspectives*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

Long, Edward LeRoy. *War and Conscience in America*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.

Macquarrie, John (ed.) *Dictionary of Christian Ethics*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1956.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Christianity and Power Politics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.

Potter, Ralph B. *War and Moral Discourse*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1969.

Ramsey, Paul. *The Just War:* Force and Political Responsibility. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968.

_____. *War and the Christian Conscience:* How Shall Modern War be Conducted Justly? Durham: Duke University Press, 1961.

Religion and the Public Order. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, I - (1968-).

Seifert, Harvey. *Conquest by Suffering:* The Process and Prospects of Nonviolent Resistence. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

_____. *Ethical Resources for International Relations.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Tillich, Paul. *Systematic Theology.* 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951-1963.